Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 89-426
H. R. 14012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 14012 1
Digest of Public Law 89-426 2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 14012

Feb. 21, 1966	House received supplemental estimates for fiscal year 1966. H. Doc. 383. Print of document.
Mar. 8, 1966	House received supplemental estimates for increased pay costs. H. Doc. 405. Print of document.
Mar. 25, 1966	House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 14012. H. Report 1349. Print of bill and report.
Mar. 29, 1966	House passed H. R. 14012 as reported.
	Senate received supplemental appropriation estimate. S. Doc. 85. Print of document.
April 1, 1966	H. R. 14012 was referred to Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
April 25, 1966	Senate committee reported H. R. 14012 with amendments. S. Report 1137. Print of bill and report.
April 27, 1966	Senate passed H. R. 14012 with amendments.
	Senate conferees were appointed.
	Print of bill as passed by Senate.
May 3, 1966	House conferees were appointed on H. R. 14012.
May 5, 1966	House received conference report on H. R. 14012. H. Report 1476. Print of report.
May 10, 1966	Both Houses agreed to conference report.
May 13, 1966	Approved: Public Law 89-426.

Hearings: House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-426

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1966. Includes items for this Department as follows: $30,000,000 for the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund, Farmers Home Administration, for hurricane disaster loans in the Southeast and snow disaster loans in the Upper Midwest; $7,500,000 for the Forest Service for fighting forest fires; $15,841,000 for increased pay costs of the Department pursuant to Public Law 89-301; $65,000,000 for funds appropriated to the President for disaster relief, from which funds will be advanced to the Farmers Home Administration; $15,100,000 to the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for repair of hurricane damage in the Southeast; and various amounts for claims and judgments.

Feb. 21, 1966
Nos. 29 and 30

purposes of research or experimentation; to Agriculture Committee.

36. PERSONNEL. H. R. 12924 by Rep. Cunningham, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

H. R. 12959 by Rep. Ashley, to provide that the value of annuities and pensions payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act or any other Federal law shall not be taken into account for State inheritance tax purposes; to Ways and Means Committee.

37. MILK. H. R. 12958 by Rep. Anderson, to provide a special milk program for children; to Agriculture Committee.

COMMITTEE PRINT RECEIVED IN THIS OFFICE

38. TOBACCO. "The European Common Market and U. S. Tobacco Imports," a study with members of Congress, Government agencies, and representatives of the tobacco industry participating. H. Agriculture Committee.

HOUSE - Continued

39. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President supplemental estimates for the fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. 383), which includes proposals for this Department as follows:

Forest Service - Forest protection and utilization:	
For pay costs pursuant to Public Law 89-301.....	$ 2,790,000
For fighting forest fires.....	7,500,000
Total	$10,290,000

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS FEB. 23:
World war on hunger, H. Agriculture (Secretary Freeman to testify).
USDA appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec).
Economic symposium commemorating Employment Act, Jt. Economic Committee.

oOo

89TH CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DOCUMENT
No. 383

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1966

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR VARIOUS AGENCIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

FEBRUARY 21, 1966.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 21, 1966.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed supplemental appropriations involving new obligational authority of $1,782,388,000 for various agencies for the fiscal year 1966. In addition, other proposals not increasing new obligational authority are made for transfers between appropriations and appropriations to liquidate obligations incurred under previously granted contract authority.

The details of these proposed appropriations and provisions, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for their submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

50-011—66——1

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions for the fiscal year 1966 in the following amounts:

	New obligational authority	Proposals not increasing new obligational authority
The judiciary	1,385,000	
Executive branch	1,781,003,000	
Liquidation of contract authorization		5,500,000
Transfers between appropriations		11,518,000
Increases in limitations		1,306,100
Payable from postal revenues		40,000,000
Total, new obligational authority	1,782,388,000	
District of Columbia funds	(1,459,800)	

The transmittal of these proposed supplemental appropriations should be considered as part of your transmittal to the Congress of your 1967 budget. All of the requests for appropriations for the executive branch contained herein were listed as specific items in the 1967 budget or are covered in the allowance for contingencies within the 1966 totals as shown in the 1967 budget. For the items specifically identified in the budget the requests are almost $6 million under the budgeted amounts.

About 51 percent of the total new obligational authority (or $901.6 million) is to carry out legislation enacted at the last session of the Congress (other than for pay increases). By far the largest item is $367.8 million for payments to trust funds for medicare, mostly as a repayable advance as needed for the supplementary medical insurance program. Other large amounts are: $184 million for the elementary and secondary school assistance program, $151.8 million for veterans' compensation and pensions, $105 million for payment to the social security trust funds for military service credits, $39 million for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation, and $21 million for Ryukyuan claims for damages during the early part of the military occupation.

In addition to those mandatory requirements included among the legislation referred to above, some 30 percent or $526.7 million is required for mandatory payments under laws passed prior to the last session of Congress. The principal items in this category are: $381 million for public assistance grants and $136.2 million for the growth in veterans' compensation and pension caseload and rates.

About $90 million is for emergency expenses. Most of this ($75 million) is for disaster relief, for assistance to the 16 States where disasters have been declared this fiscal year and to provide for future emergencies. Approximately $12 million is to repair Hurricane Betsy damage to Corps of Engineers navigation and other projects.

Almost $205 million is needed to cover the cost of the pay increases granted in the last session of the Congress for those appropriation items in this submission. As is customary, these amounts have been included

in this submission so that the Congress will not have to review the same appropriation items again for pay increase costs. A later request will cover the cost of the pay increases for the remainder of the Government. The pay increase laws relating to this submission are Public Law 89–132, increasing the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and Public Law 89–301, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Of the remaining $60.6 million, almost 80 percent is for the Post Office Department to handle the rapidly growing volume of mail.

In addition, $5.5 million is recommended to liquidate obligations incurred under previously granted contract authority and transfers are proposed between appropriations in lieu of new appropriations in a few instances.

I recommend that the the attached proposed appropriations and provisions be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE CONSOLIDATED SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Judiciary

Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:	
Salaries of judges	$220,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	1,165,000

Funds Appropriated to the President

Transitional grants to Alaska	876,000
Disaster relief	75,000,000

Agriculture

Forest Service: Forest protection and utilization	10,290,000

Commerce

Patent Office: Salaries and expenses	1,000,000

Defense—Civil

Department of the Army:	
Corps of Engineers—Civil:	
Operation and maintenance, general	7,350,000
Flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies	7,750,000
Ryukyu Islands, Army: Ryukyuan pretreaty claims	21,040,000
Panama Canal: Canal Zone Government: Operating expenses	404,000

Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education:	
Expansion and improvement of vocational education	950,000
Vocational student loan insurance fund	50,000
Elementary and secondary educational activities	184,000,000
Higher educational activities	11,000,000
Civil rights educational activities	3,250,000
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration: Grants to States	39,000,000
Public Health Service: National Library of Medicine	4,175,000
Social Security Administration:	
Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged	367,800,000
Payment for military service credits	105,000,000
Welfare Administration: Grants to States for public assistance	381,000,000
Special Institutions:	
Gallaudet College: Salaries and expenses	24,000
Howard University: Salaries and expenses	216,000
Office of the Secretary: Office of Field Administration: Salaries and expenses	27,000

Interior

Bureau of Land Management: Management of lands and resources	1,495,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs: Resources management	755,000
National Park Service:	
Management and protection	1,307,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	924,000
Construction	1,169,000
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	5,500,000

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: Management and investigations of resources	$203,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Management and investigations of resources	763,000
Southwestern Power Administration: Construction	520,000

JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration: Fees and expenses of witnesses	Language
Federal Prison System: Support of United States prisoners	500,000

LABOR

Manpower Administration:	
Trade adjustment activities	Language
Bureau of Employment Security: Salaries and expenses	Language
Wage and Labor Standards: Wage and Hour Division: Salaries and expenses	Language

POST OFFICE

Operations	271,904,000
Transportation	21,000,000
Plant and equipment	3,106,000

STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs:	
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	500,000
Payment to foreign service retirement and disability fund	45,000
International Commissions: American sections, international commissions	32,000

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Compensation and pensions	288,000,000
Readjustment benefits	5,000,000

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Salaries and expenses	468,000

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses	742,000

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses	68,000

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Limitation on salaries and expenses	Language

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Federal payment to District of Columbia	2,300,000
District of Columbia funds: Operating expenses:	
Public safety	1,249,200
Parks and recreation	210,600
Totals:	
All proposed supplemental appropriations	1,829,347,800
Deduct amounts—	
Payable from District of Columbia funds	1,459,800
Payable from increased postal revenues (resulting from increased volume of mail to be handled under proposed supplemental, above)	40,000,000
For liquidation of contract authorization	5,500,000
New obligational authority	1,782,388,000

DETAIL OF PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, namely:

THE JUDICIARY

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", $220,000.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and commissioners", $1,165,000.

As provided by statute, proposed supplemental appropriations for the judiciary are transmitted to the Congress without change.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Transitional Grants to Alaska

For an additional amount for "Transitional grants to Alaska", $876,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation is requested to complete payment of grants authorized by Public Law 88–311, approved May 27, 1964, to assist the State of Alaska in recovering from the earthquake of March 27, 1964. The amount is based on final data on the State's revenue losses in 1965.

Disaster Relief

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", *including not to exceed $75,000 for the purposes of section 5 of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–41)*, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.*

The purpose of this proposed supplemental appropriation is to make disaster relief funds available to the 16 States where disasters have already been declared and to insure that sufficient funds are available to cover emergency requirements during the remainder of fiscal year 1966. Funds are also included to pay for the study authorized by Public Law 89–41 and completed by the Corps of Engineers under the direction of the Office of Emergency Planning.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For additional amounts for "Forest protection and utilization', as follows:

"Forest land management", $9,635,000;
"Forest research", $610,000; and
"State and private forestry cooperation", $45,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation of $10,290 thousand includes $7,500 thousand for fighting forest fires, and $2,790 thousand for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301. The amount for fighting forest fires covers actual expenses through December 31, 1965, and estimated costs for the rest of the fiscal year. Since the fall season in the Southwest was wetter than usual, costs are lower than they have been for many years.

This appropriation was apportioned, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent Office

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $1,000,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation will provide $605 thousand to cover the increased pay and associated costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301 and $395 thousand for printing an additional 5,000 patents for issuance under the acceleration provisions of Public Law 89–83.

This appropriation was apportioned, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. These actions were reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on October 6, 1965, and January 28, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Operation and Maintenance, General

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", $7,350,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation will provide $4,230 thousand for repair and restoration of navigation facilities damaged by hurricane Betsy. It also will provide $3,120 thousand for the cost of pay increases authorized by or pursuant to law.

This appropriation was apportioned, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased

pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

Flood Control, Hurricane and Shore Protection Emergencies

For an additional amount for "Flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies", $7,750,000, to remain available until expended.

These funds are for costs of emergency activities associated with hurricane Betsy and to establish a reasonable contingency fund to meet needs anticipated during the 1966 spring flood season.

RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY

RYUKYUAN PRETREATY CLAIMS

For payments authorized by the Act of October 27, 1965 (Public Law 89–296), $21,040,000, to remain available for two years from the effective date of this Act.

This appropriation will implement the act of October 27, 1965 (Public Law 89–296), which authorizes the United States to make an ex-gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands in consideration of damages caused by acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, during the military occupation of the Ryukyu Islands from August 15, 1945, to April 28, 1952.

THE PANAMA CANAL

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Operating Expenses

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", $404,000.

The additional amount required is a result of increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301 ($259 thousand) and overtime compensation for police and firemen resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–282 ($145 thousand).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Expansion and improvement of vocational education", *for advances for reserve funds and interest payments on insured loans under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965*, $950,000.

VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

For the vocational student loan insurance fund created by section 13 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1046) $50,000, to remain available until expended.

These proposed supplemental appropriations will provide for prompt initiation of activities under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. Repayable advances are to be made to State and nonprofit private loan insurance funds and interest costs are to be paid for students in postsecondary business, trade, technical, and vocational schools. A direct Federal loan guarantee fund is established for purchase of loans upon default by student borrowers.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Elementary and secondary educational activities", *for meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children under Title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended,* $184,000,000.

The Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966 (approved September 23, 1965), provided for payments for education of disadvantaged children up to the full $1,177 million authorized by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, although the actual appropriation was $775 million. The supplemental appropriation proposed herein is to pay school district requirements which exceed the currently available funds.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher educational activities," $11,000,000, *of which $10,000,000 shall be for basic grants authorized in section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and $1,000,000 shall be be for training grants under section 223 of such act.*

This proposed supplemental appropriation will provide for initiation of the library assistance program authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965. Grants are to be made to higher educational institutions for acquisition of library books and materials and for training in the information sciences.

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Civil rights educational activities," *including not to exceed $250,000 for salaries and expenses,* $3,250,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation will finance additional training and technical assistance activities for alleviation of problems caused by desegregation of schools as authorized in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The present requirements to make this program effective exceed the funds appropriated. The supplemental appropriation will provide for an additional 24 institute programs; permit establishment of two centers for pre-service training and provide for 20 grants to major cities, school districts, and State departments of education. This increased program effort, much of it to be conducted in the summer, will provide the needed advance preparation for the coming school year.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES

For an additional amount for "Grants to States," *for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended,* $39,000,000.

Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 89–333, approved November 8, 1965) provide for increased allotments and an increased rate of Federal sharing in the cost of the program for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the act. The increased grants permitted the States will enable them to expand their vocational rehabilitation services and to successfully rehabilitate an additional 24,000 individuals in 1966.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated the necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action

was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on December 27, 1965.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount for "National Library of Medicine", *including carrying out the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1059)*, $4,175,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1967.

This supplemental request is to initiate several programs authorized by the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, approved on October 22, 1965. Included are: (1) $1 million to conduct a research and development program in medical science information storage, transmission, retrieval, distribution, and utilization, (2) $2 million for grants to medical libraries to be used in expanding and improving their level of resources and services, and (3) $700 thousand for grants to institutions to train more graduate medical librarians. Small amounts also are requested to implement other programs authorized by the act and to provide for the administrative costs.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENT TO TRUST FUNDS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance trust funds, as authorized by sections 103 and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and section 1844 of the Social Security Act, $367,800,000, of which $342,000,000 shall remain available through December 31, 1967, as authorized by section 1844.

The proposed supplemental appropriation would provide an advance of $342 million to the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund as determined by the formula prescribed under Section 1844 of the Social Security Amendments of 1965. The advance, available through calendar year 1967 and repayable without interest, will provide, if needed, both an operating fund at the beginning of the program and a contingency reserve for the supplementary medical benefits. The proposed supplemental would also provide $25,800 thousand to reimburse the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses incurred in the current fiscal year under the program to provide hospital insurance benefits for aged individuals not covered under the social security or railroad retirement programs. Benefit and administrative costs for this latter group are to be paid by the general fund rather than from the receipts of the Hospital Insurance payroll tax.

PAYMENT FOR MILITARY SERVICE CREDITS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the Federal Disability Insurance, and the Federal Hospital Insurance trust funds, for benefit payments and other costs resulting from noncontributory coverage extended certain veterans as provided under section 217(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, $105,000,000.

The proposed supplemental appropriation would provide the first annual installment to reimburse the Social Security trust funds for past and future benefit payments and other costs resulting from noncontributory credit for military service. Section 217(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended on July 30, 1965, requires such installment

reimbursement over 50 years beginning in fiscal year 1966 in order to place these trust funds in the position they would have been if noncontributory credit for military service had not been provided.

Welfare Administration

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance", $381,000,000.

The proposed supplemental appropriation would provide additional Federal contribution to the States for public assistance according to formulas prescribed by the Social Security Act as amended. Recent program trends and estimates submitted by the States indicate that the appropriation for 1966 will fall short of meeting the Federal share of State expenditures by an estimated $381 million. This amount includes $26,025 thousand which was taken from the 1966 appropriation and used to complete the 1965 requirements.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated the necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 17, 1965.

Special Institutions

GALLAUDET COLLEGE, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", $24,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation is for adjustment of compensation and personnel benefits of nonfaculty employees in line with similar increases provided for Federal Government personnel under Public Law 89–301. These additional costs could not be absorbed without curtailing the educational program of the College.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Howard University, salaries and expenses", $216,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes $138,500 for adjustment of compensation and personnel benefits of nonfaculty employees in line with similar increases provided for Federal Government personnel under Public Law 89–301 and $77,500 for Social Security premium rates in line with changes under Public Law 89–97. These additional costs could not be absorbed without curtailing the educational program of the University.

Office of the Secretary

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration", $27,000, *together with not to exceed $68,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.*

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes $36 thousand for the cost of civilian pay increases resulting from Public Law 89–301, and $59 thousand for additional workload resulting from enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 and the Older Americans

Act of 1965. The latter two enactments result in additional requests by the States for technical assistance and consultation.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated the necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $1,495,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes $1 million to cover the cost of emergency fire suppression and rehabilitation of burned-over lands incurred during the summer of 1965 and to meet such anticipated expenses for the remainder of the current fiscal year. The balance, $495 thousand, is to cover increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", $755,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes $186 thousand to cover fire suppression costs incurred through December 31, 1965, and such anticipated costs for the remainder of the current fiscal year. The balance, $569 thousand, is to cover increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", $1,307,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes: (*a*) $245 thousand to cover emergency fire suppression expenses incurred during the summer of 1965 and to meet such anticipated expenses during the remainder of the current fiscal year, (*b*) $279 thousand for initial staffing of 13 newly authorized park areas, (*c*) $741 thousand to cover increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301, and (*d*) $42 thousand for compensation for overtime work by Park Police as authorized by Public Law 89–282.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay and fire suppression costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on December 28, 1965.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", $924,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes: (*a*) $97 thousand for the initial maintenance staff at nine new park areas, (*b*) $724 thousand for increases for wage-board employees, and (*c*) $103 thousand for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs, including those for wage board employees. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $1,169,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation provides funds for the reconstruction of roads and other facilities damaged by hurricane, flood, storm, and other uncontrollable causes. Early restoration will permit full use of the park system during the vacation period.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)", $5,500,000, to remain available until expended.

These funds will be used to liquidate obligations incurred under the contract authority granted in the Federal Aid Highway Act. Currently available funds are not sufficient to cover existing and anticipated obligations in the current fiscal year.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $203,000.

Additional funds are requested for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301 ($148 thousand), and for pesticides research ($55 thousand). The funding for pesticides research is to provide for increased studies to monitor the occurrence of pesticide residues in commercial fish and shellfish as authorized by Public Law 89–232, which increased the ceiling on appropriations for pesticides research activities.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased

pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $763,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes: $478 thousand for civilian pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301, $180 thousand for wage-board increases and $105 thousand for pesticides research. The funding for pesticides research is to increase the effort to determine the effects of presently used and potentially promising chemicals on fish and wildlife as authorized by Public Law 89–232, which raised the ceiling on appropriations for pesticides research activities.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $520,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation will assure timely completion of the Jonesboro-Idalia Line in southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas. Prompt completion is necessary to assure adequate and continuous electric service to several municipalities served by the Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

In addition to the amount heretofore made available in the appropriation under this head for the current fiscal year for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), not to exceed $25,000 shall be available in such appropriation for such compensation and expenses.

This proposed provision is required to increase the limitation in the 1966 appropriation act on the total amount that may be paid to expert witnesses. Costs of expert witnesses have increased substantially over the comparable period in 1965 and indicate that the amount under the current limitation will be insufficient to meet the needs for the entire fiscal year 1966.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", $500,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation is to cover the increased cost of keeping Federal prisoners in non-Federal jails. Recently

negotiated contracts with State and local jurisdictions require payment of substantially higher rates for use of local jails than were provided in the enacted appropriation.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on December 29, 1965.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses of worker adjustment assistance allowances and for administration of adjustment assistance services to workers, as provided in Title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794), and Title III of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–283), $10,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", and to remain available until expended.

The new Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 as well as the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides for workers' allowances to the employees of firms which have been dislocated as a result of changes in tariffs. Workers can apply for assistance under the new act during the current fiscal year. The allowance payments and State administrative costs would be financed by transferring $10 million from unneeded balances of another account.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses," $1,043,000, *of which $836,900 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" and $206,100 may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.*

These funds are to finance: (1) the increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301 ($238 thousand) and (2) the costs associated with Public Law 89–236 ($805 thousand), which requires that persons seeking to immigrate to the United States for employment be individually certified by the Secretary of Labor as not causing an adverse effect on American workers at the time and place of the immigrant's employment. In carrying out the latter law the Secretary must start making determinations in fiscal year 1966, and will require additional staff for this purpose.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

Wage and Labor Standards

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", $614,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appro-*

priation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen."

These proposed additional funds, to be derived by transfer, are to provide for the increased pay and associated costs resulting from Public Law 89–301 ($264 thousand) and to permit the Wage and Hour Division to administer the Service Contract Act of 1965, Public Law 89–286 ($350 thousand). The Service Contract Act, which became effective on January 20, 1966, provides labor standards for the protection of employees of contractors and subcontractors furnishing services to Federal agencies.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

Operations

For an additional amount for "Operations", $271,904,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation is needed to: (1) handle a mail volume which is increasing at a rate substantially greater than estimated in the 1966 budget ($57,000 thousand), (2) comply with the requirements of Public Law 89–116, approved August 9, 1965, which provides for a 5-day work week for postmasters ($9,500 thousand), (3) improve parcel delivery services ($2,000 thousand), (4) meet increased pay and associated costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301 ($197,211 thousand) and (5) cover terminal leave payments pursuant to Public Law 89–205 ($6,193 thousand).

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on October 1, 1965, and on December 23, 1965.

Transportation

For an additional amount for "Transportation", $21,000,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation is needed to purchase transportation services for a mail volume which is increasing at a rate substantially greater than estimated in the 1966 budget.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on December 29, 1965.

Plant and Equipment

For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", $3,106,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation is needed to accelerate the procurement and installation of mechanical equipment in post offices as part of a stepped-up program to improve efficiency and service.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service", $500,000.

This supplemental appropriation is to increase the amount available to finance unanticipated expenses arising in the conduct of foreign affairs.

PAYMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, $45,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation is to finance changes made by the Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1965 in the annuities of Foreign Service personnel who retired before October 1960. Prior to the payment of increased annuities, an appropriation is required by the act in order to prevent an increase in the unfunded liability of the fund for the first fiscal year in which increased benefits are paid.

International Commissions

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For an additional amount for "American sections, international commissions", *for expenses necessary to enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States pursuant to the agreement between the United States and Canada, signed March 25, 1965, through the Lake Ontario Claims Tribunal, including salaries and expenses of personnel and dependents, as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801–1158)*, $32,000.

Funds are requested for the preparation of the claims of American citizens against Canada for damage caused in 1951–1952 by high waters to property located along the south shore of Lake Ontario. These claims must be prepared during the current fiscal year for presentation to the Lake Ontario Claims Tribunal early in the fiscal year 1967.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Compensation and Pensions

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", $288,000,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes $136,229 thousand to cover additional compensation and pension costs resulting from increases in the average rate payable and in caseload. It also includes $151,771 thousand for costs attributable to the enactment of new legislation (Public Laws 89–132, 89–137, 89–138, 89–214, and 89–311) which increased certain disability compensation rates, provided for a death gratuity payment and made other liberalizations.

On December 21, 1965, this appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. The action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on that date.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Additional funds are needed to cover costs of legislation enacted in the first session of the 89th Congress. This includes $3.9 million for costs under Public Law 89–222, approved September 30, 1965, which increased the monthly payment to children in training under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956, as amended, and $1.1 million required as a result of Public Law 89–138, approved August 26, 1965, which extended the time available to seriously disabled veterans for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training.

On December 21, 1965, this appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated the necessity for a supplemental appropriation. The action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on that date.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $468,000.

The requested funds will provide for the initiation of a study of the problems of race and education, as requested by the President in November 1965, and for increased pay and related costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301. The study will cost $442 thousand in 1966 and the pay increases are estimated to cost $26 thousand.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $742,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes $459 thousand for the costs of processing 5,600 more complaints of discrimination in employment than originally anticipated. These complaints must receive prompt attention in view of the statutory limitation on the time during which the Commission can act on incoming complaints. An additional $231 thousand is included to develop a program of affirmative action designed to achieve voluntary compliance with the objective of equal employment opportunities. The remaining $52 thousand will finance increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased

pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $68,000.

The 1966 appropriation included $15 thousand for the cost of printing the 1985 Comprehensive Development Plan for Washington, D.C., and related reports. The current estimate of cost is $71 thousand. This proposed supplemental appropriation includes $50 thousand for these printing costs and $18 thousand for pay and associated costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", $1,075,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

The proposed increase in limitation would provide $225 thousand to cover increased pay and related costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301 and $850 thousand to administer the increased workload created by the Social Security Amendments of 1965, Public Law 89–97. These amendments, making changes in the old-age and survivors and disability insurance programs, also required the Railroad Retirement Board to make corresponding adjustments in its benefit rates and to participate in the new programs of hospital and medical benefits.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on December 29, 1965.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" for the general fund, $2,300,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation provides an increase in the Federal payment to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1966. This amount, together with that previously appropriated, will not exceed the current authorization.

OPERATING EXPENSES

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", *including $3,700 for disbursement by the administrative office of the United States*

courts for expenses of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, $1,249,200, of which $111,600 shall be payable from the highway fund, $200 from the water fund, and $200 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

This amount includes $806 thousand for overtime pay for policemen and firemen resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–282, $426,500 for increased pay and associated costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301, and $16,700 for wage-board rate increases.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", $210,600.

This amount includes $20,400 for overtime pay for United States Park Police resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–282, $107,700 for increased pay and associated costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301, and $82,500 for wage-board rate increases.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year involved.

○

March 8, 1966
No. 41

13. VIRGIN ISLANDS. Received a GAO report on examination of financial statements for fiscal year 1965 of the Virgin Islands Corporation. p. 4993

14. LANDS; PROPERTY. Received from Interior a proposed bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 4994

15. WATER RESOURCES. Received from Interior a proposed bill "to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 4994

16. EMPLOYMENT. Received from Labor a proposed bill, "Employment Service Act of 1966"; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. p. 4994

17. LIBRARIES. Received from HEW a proposed bill "to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act"; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. p. 4994

18. EDUCATION. Received from HEW a proposed bill "to strengthen and improve public and private programs of assistance for institutions of higher education and students attending them"; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. p. 4994

19. AIR POLLUTION. Received from HEW a proposed bill to amend and extend the Clean Air Act; to Public Works Committee. p. 4994

HOUSE

20. DAYLIGHT TIME. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 6785, to establish uniform dates throughout the U. S. for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed. p. D178

21. COMMODITY RESERVES. Rep. Quie spoke in opposition to H. R. 12784, the commodity reserve bill, stating that "the Nation's agricultural stability is being undermined by the Commodity Credit Corporation's policy of dumping surplus stock onto the market in order to prevent price increases." pp. 5105-6

Reps. Gerald R. Ford, Gross, and Nelsen criticized administration's "corn dumping" policy and Rep. Ford inserted a supporting article. pp. 5094-5, 5096

22. CONSERVATION. Rep. Sikes praised the "great strides in resource conservation" being made in Florida "with the technical help of the Soil Conservation Service." p. 5095

23. MONETARY POLICY. Reps. Curtis and Patman discussed recent Joint Economic Committee hearings on monetary policies. pp. 5106-9

24. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Nelsen inserted a letter from the National Farmers Union in support of his bill to alleviate the "serious boxcar shortage." pp. 5101-2

25. ANTIDUMPING. Rep. Curtis spoke in support of his bill directing the President to prepare an international agreement to "harmonize the administration of the antidumping laws and regulations of all nations." pp. 5112-15

26. ECONOMICS. Rep. Cleveland inserted an editorial supporting Rep. Curtis proposal for the creation of a minority economic council. p. 5116

27. POVERTY. Received from OEO a proposed bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty; to Education and Labor Committee. p. 5132

28. MARKETING; CREDIT. Rep. Mink urged passage of pending legislation on truth-in-lending and truth-in-packaging. pp. 5128-9

29. FARM LABOR. Rep. Cohelan criticized and inserted a leaflet issued by the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation which urges the defeat of H. R. 10518, the farmworkers minimum wage bill, because it would "ban the use of children under 12 years of age in agriculture." pp. 5130-31

30. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President supplemental appropriation estimates for the fiscal year 1966, which include pay cost appropriations for the Department in the amount of $13,051,000 and transfer of $64,000. Including the pay cost supplemental previously submitted for the Forest Service in H. Doc. 383 the total appropriations requested for the Department are $15,841,000. A table reflecting the amounts for each agency is attached. (H. Doc. 405) p. 5132

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

31. FARM LABOR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Younger inserting a report on economic losses in Calif. due to the alleged shortage of farm labor. pp. A1273-4

32. FORESTS Rep. Perkins inserted Edward P. Cliff's speech, "Making the Most of Kentucky's Forests." pp. A1283-5

33. WATER POLLUTION. Rep. Sickles inserted an article urging cooperation and determination to develop water pollution programs. pp. A1291-2
Rep. Fraser inserted an article, "Water Pollution: Public Enemy." p. A1299
Rep. McCarthy inserted article supporting the President's proposed clean rivers program. pp. A1309-10

34. INFLATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Quillen stating that "the concern of our people over the inflationary trend of our economy has been increasing for the past several months", and inserting an article, "A Dollar's Value." pp. A1298-9

35. GAO; ACCOUNTING. Rep. Reuss inserted an article commending the appointment of Elmer Staats as Comptroller General and praising the "watchdog role" of the General Accounting Office. pp. A1301-2

36. MILK. Extension of remarks of Rep. Race stating that "budget proposals to curtail funds for the school milk program and the school lunch program have alarmed parents and school administrators all across the Nation." pp. A1302-3

37. HOUSING Rep. Farbstein inserted an article dealing with the possible cost of the President's cities demonstration program, together with his comments. pp. A1311-2

Supplemental Appropriations and Transfers for
Pay Costs Included in House Documents 383 and 405

Agency	1966 Pay Act Costs
Agricultural Research Service	$3,671,000
Cooperative State Research Service	32,000
Extension Service:	
Federal Extension Service	64,000 a/
Farmer Cooperative Service	26,000
Soil Conservation Service:	
Conservation operations	2,608,000
Watershed planning	140,000
Watershed protection	585,000
Flood prevention	160,000
Great Plains conservation program	82,000
Resource conservation and development	46,000
Economic Research Service	246,000
Statistical Reporting Service	250,000
Consumer and Marketing Service:	
Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs	1,905,000
Foreign Agricultural Service	178,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	28,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	202,000
Rural Electrification Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	268,000
Farmers Home Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	1,200,000
Rural Community Development Service	12,000
Office of the Inspector General	145,000
Office of the General Counsel	102,000
Office of Information	26,000

Agency	1966 Pay Act Costs
National Agricultural Library	36,000
Office of Management Services	59,000
General Administration	80,000
Forest Service:	
Forest protection and utilization	2,790,000 b/
Forest roads and trails	964,000
TOTAL, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE:	
Appropriations	15,841,000
Transfers	64,000

a/ To be provided by transfer from 'Payments to States and Puerto Rico".

b/ Transmitted in H. Doc. 383, February 21, 1966 along with supplemental for fighting forest fires.

March 9, 1966

89th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - House Document No. 405

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND PROVISIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1966, FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



MARCH 8, 1966.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

50-011 WASHINGTON : 1966

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 8, 1966.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $971,393,220 for various agencies and $1,595,200 for the District of Columbia.

The details of these proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for their submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions for the fiscal year 1966 for all three branches of the Federal Government and for the District of Columbia. The appropriations and provisions are required because of pay increases granted by recent laws and administrative actions pursuant to law, as follows:

The act of August 21, 1965 (Public Law 89–132), increased the basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

The act of October 29, 1965 (Public Law 89–301), increased the rates of basic compensation of certain civilian officers and employees in the Federal Government and permitted comparable pay increases to be granted by administrative action.

Actions by agency heads pursuant to law (5 U.S.C. 1082(7)), increased the pay of so-called wage-board employees in line with prevailing rates for comparable jobs in private industry.

Supplemental appropriations from Federal funds totaling $971 million are recommended herein to meet the additional costs of these pay increases. In addition, $209 million has been previously transmitted to the Congress in requests for supplemental appropriations involving other requirements. The $1,180 million in these requests:

Was included in the 1966 estimates shown in the budget transmitted to the Congress on January 24 of this year;

Reflects the absorption in total of 11 percent of the costs of pay increases for military personnel and 32 percent of the costs of increases for civilians, as explained more fully below.

The total estimated costs from Federal funds for the fiscal year 1966 of the pay increases authorized by the laws cited above is $1,470.3 million. This sum covers:

$870.1 million for military personnel pay increases under Public Law 89–132 of which $855.1 million is for the Department of Defense. Of this total cost, $96 million, or 11 percent, will be met from available funds.

$600.2 million for civilian pay increases under the other laws cited above. Almost $194 million, or 32 percent, of the total cost will be met from available funds although congressional action, such as increasing limitations on administrative expenses and transferring funds between current appropriations, is needed to make this possible.

The above amounts include $193.6 million for related costs such as the Government retirement contribution, insurance, and employment taxes, which are based on pay levels and increase as the pay levels rise.

A tabular statement summarizing the details of the proposals by departments and agencies is included in the attachment.

Where necessary to meet increased pay costs, the appropriations of the agencies in the executive branch were apportioned, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), so as to indicate the necessity for supplemental estimates. These actions were reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 28, 1966, and on various other dates on which apportionment actions were taken during the fiscal year.

The details of the proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions are set forth in the attachment to the letter and I recommend their transmittal to the Congress in the amounts specified.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate:
"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators", $8,065;
"Salaries, officers and employees", $643,105;
"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", $7,425;
Contingent expenses of the Senate:
"Senate policy committees", $9,940;
"Automobiles and maintenance", $840;
"Inquiries and investigations", $116,865, including $3,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;
"Folding documents", $945;
"Miscellaneous items", $20,065, including $4,200 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87–82, approved July 6, 1961;
Joint Items:
"Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures", $945, to remain available until expended;
Contingent expenses of the Senate:
"Joint Economic Committee", $9,000;
"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", $8,250;
"Joint Committee on Printing", $3,750;

House:
"Compensation of Members", $7,500;
"Office of the Speaker", $3,155;
"Office of the Parliamentarian", $2,755;
"Compilation of Precedents", $270;
"Office of the Chaplain", $410;
"Office of the Clerk", $41,230;
"Office of the Sergeant at Arms", $28,205;
"Office of the Doorkeeper", $43,745;
"Office of the Postmaster", $13,825;
"Committee employees", $103,000;
"Six minority employees", $3,175;
"Majority floor leader", $2,340;
"Minority floor leader", $1,940;
"Majority whip", $1,565;
"Minority whip", $1,565;
"Printing clerks", $430;
"Technical assistant to attending physician", $385;
"Official reporters of debates", $6,880;
"Official reporters to committees", $6,940;
"Legislative counsel", $7,970;
"Member's clerk hire", $770,000;
"Special and select committees", $100,000;
"Coordinator of information", $3,675;
"Revision of the laws", $730;
"Speaker's auto", $330;
"Majority leader's auto", $330;
"Minority leader's auto", $330;
"Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation", $10,530;
"Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy", $655;
"Joint Committee on Defense Production", $2,160;

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued

Architeet of the Capitol:
Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", $13,900;
Capitol buildings and grounds:
"Capitol buildings", $40,000;
"Capitol grounds", $10,000;
"Senate office buildings", $31,000;
"Senate garage", $600;
"Capitol power plant", $10,000;
"Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care", $13,000;
Botanic Garden: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000;
Library of Congress:
"Salaries and expenses", $283,000;
Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", $51,500;
Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", $67,000;
Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses", $65,300;
Books for the Blind: "Salaries and expenses", $7,300;
"Collection and distribution of library materials (speeial foreign currency program)", $3,600;
Government Printing Offiee: "Salaries and expenses", $70,800;

THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States:
"Salaries", $41,000;
"Care of Buildings and Grounds", $5,000;
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;
Customs Court: "Salaries and expenses", $19,000;
Court of Claims: "Salaries and expenses", $13,300;
Court of appeals; district courts, and other judicial serviees:
"Salaries of supporting personnel", $818,000;
"Administrative Offiee of the United States Court", $31,000;
"Expenses of referees", $125,000, to be derived from the Referees' salary and expense fund";

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The White House Office:
"Salaries and expenses", $85,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Special projects", fiscal year 1966;*
Bureau of the Budget: "Salaries and expenses", $131,000;
Council of Economic Advisers: "Salaries and expenses,", $8,000;
National Security Council: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000;
Office of Emergency Planning: "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies", $86,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", fiscal year 1966;*
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000;

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic Assistance:
"Administrative expenses", Agency for International Development, $980,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966;
"Administrative and other expenses", Department of State, $42,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economie assistance", fiscal year 1966;

Department of Agriculture

Agricultural Research Service:
"Salaries and expenses", as follows:
"Research", $2,402,500; and
"Plant and animal disease and pest control", $1,268,500;
Cooperative State Research Service: "Payments and expenses", $32,000;
Extension Service: "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses": *Of the amount made available under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, for "Payments to States and Puerto Rico", $64,000 shall be transferred to the subappropriation for "Federal Extension Service";*
Farmer Cooperative Service; "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;
Soil Conservation Service:
"Conservation operations", $2,608,000;
"Watershed planning", $140,000, to remain available until expended;
"Watershed protection", $585,000, to remain available until expended;
"Flood prevention", $160,000, to remain available until expended;
"Great Plains conservation program", $82,000, to remain available until expended;
"Resource conservation and development", $46,000, to remain available until expended;
Economic Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", $246,000;
Statistical Reporting Service: "Salaries and expenses", $250,000;
Consumer and Marketing Service: "Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", $1,905,000;
Foreign Agricultural Service: "Salaries and expenses", $178,000;
Commodity Exchange Authority: "Salaries and expenses", $28,000;
Rural Electrification Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $268,000;
Farmers Home Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: "Administrative and operating expenses", $202,000;
Rural Community Development Service: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;
Office of the Inspector General: "Salaries and expenses", $145,000;
Office of the General Counsel: "Salaries and expenses", $102,000;
Office of Information: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;
National Agricultural Library: "Salaries and expenses", $36,000;
Office of Management Services: "Salaries and expenses", $59,000;
General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000;
Forest Service: "Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)", $964,000, to remain available until expended;

Department of Commerce

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $89,000;
Office of Business Economics: "Salaries and expenses," $50,000;
Bureau of the Census:
"Salaries and expenses", $320,000;
"1964 Census of Agriculture," $110,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967;
Business and Defense Services Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $125,000;
International Activities:
"Salaries and expenses", $160,000, of which $23,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1967;
"Export control", $100,000, of which $33,400 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs;
Office of Field Services: "Salaries and expenses", $90,000;
Coast and Geodetic Survey: "Salaries and expenses", $510,000;

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued

National Bureau of Standards: "Research and technical services", $500,000;
Weather Bureau:
"Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;
"Research and development," $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968;
"Meteorological satellite operations," $48,000, to remain available until expended;
Maritime Administration:
"Salaries and expenses", $222,000, of which $200,000 is for administrative expenses and $22,000 is for reserve fleet expenses;
"Maritime training", $38,000;
Bureau of Public Roads: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $950,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administration and research);

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Military personnel:
"Military personnel, Army", $222,100,000;
"Military personnel, Navy", $182,600,000;
"Military personnel, Marine Corps", $42,400,000;
"Military personnel, Air Force", $227,600,000;
"Reserve personnel, Navy", $4,600,000;
"Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", $1,600,000;
"Reserve personnel, Air Force", $1,200,000;
"National Guard personnel, Army", $4,500,000;
"National Guard personnel, Air Force", $3,500,000;
"Retired pay, Defense", $71,000,000;
Operation and maintenance:
"Operation and maintenance, Army", $33,400,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Navy", $23,000,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", $1,054,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Air Force", $27,600,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", $14,356,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", $2,000,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard", $1,000,000;
"Court of Military Appeals, Defense", $11,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army:
Cemeterial expenses: "Salaries and expenses", $67,000;
Corps of Engineers—Civil: "General expenses", $385,000;
Ryukyu Islands, Army: "Administration", $40,000;
The Panama Canal:
Panama Canal Company: "Limitation on general and administrative expenses" (increase of $137,000 in the limitation on the amount available for general and administrative expenses);
United States Soldiers' Home: "Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay" (increase of $146,000 in the amount available for maintenance and operation to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund);

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service:
"Hospitals and medical care", $770,000;
"Foreign quarantine activities", $212,000;
"Indian health activities", $1,355,000;
Saint Elizabeths Hospital: "Salaries and expenses", the total amount available for "Salaries and expenses" in the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966", is hereby increased from $29,886,000 to $30,613,000;

Social Security Administration: "Limitation on salaries and expenses, Social Security Administration" (increase of $8,037,000 in the amount to be expended, as authorized by section 201 (g)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein);
Office of the Secretary:
"Salaries and expenses", $18,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund;
"Surplus property utilization", $20,000;

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Federal Housing Administration: "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration" (increases of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses);
Public Housing Administration:
"Administrative expenses", $405,000;
"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Public Housing Administration" (increase of $405,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses);

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs:
"Education and welfare services", $1,202,400;
"General administrative expenses", $103,000;
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;
Office of Territories: "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands", $102,600;
Mineral Resources:
Geological Survey: "Surveys, investigations, and research", $1,510,000;
Bureau of Mines:
"Conservation and development of mineral resources", $500,000;
"Health and safety", $92,000;
"General administrative expenses", $22,000;
Office of Oil and Gas: "Salaries and expenses", $16,300;
Fish and Wildlife Service:
Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: "Salaries and expenses", $8,500;
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:
"Management and investigation of resources", $86,800, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development", fiscal year 1966;
"General administrative expenses", $15,000;
"Administration of Pribilof Islands", $10,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: "General administrative expenses", $34,300;
National Park Service: "General administrative expenses", $57,000;
Bureau of Reclamation: "General administrative expenses", $241,200, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operation and maintenance", fiscal year 1966;
Bonneville Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $173,000;
Southwestern Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $25,300;
Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $109,800;
Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $105,000;
Office of Water Resources Research: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000;

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration:
"Salaries and expenses, general administration", $75,000;
Alien property activities: "Limitation on general administrative expenses (increase of $7,000 in the amount for general administrative expenses)'
"Salaries and expenses, antitrust division", $165,000;
"Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", $647,000;
Federal Bureau of Investigation: "Salaries and expenses", $3,735,000;
Immigration and Naturalization Service: "Salaries and expenses", $1,782,000;
Federal Prison System; "Salaries and expenses", $1,035,000;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration:
Office of Manpower Administrator: "Salaries and expenses", $66,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;*
"Manpower development and training activities", $25,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;*
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training: "Salaries and expenses", $87,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;*
Wage and Labor Standards:
Bureau of Labor Standards: "Salaries and expenses", $39,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;*
Women's Bureau: "Salaries and expenses", $11,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen," fiscal year 1966;*
Bureau of Employees' Compensation: "Salaries and expenses", $58,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966,* together with not to exceed $1,550 to be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 944);
Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Salaries and expenses", $242,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment ment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;*
Bureau of International Labor Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen," fiscal year 1966;*
Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966,* together with not to exceed $3,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, unemployment trust fund;
Office of the Secretary:
"Salaries and expenses", $35,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;*
"Federal contract compliance program", $7,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

"Administration and regional operation", $2,059,000;

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,760,000, *of which $1,299,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966, and $123,600 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Extension and remodeling, State Department Building"*;

International organizations and conferences: "Missions to international organizations", $59,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966;*

International commissions:

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: "Salaries and expenses", $17,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966;*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $138,000;

Bureau of Customs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,043,000;

Bureau of Narcotics: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000;

Bureau of the Public Debt: "Administering the public debt", $360,000;

Coast Guard:

"Operating expenses", $9,400,000;

"Retired pay", $1,000,000;

"Reserve training", $1,050,000;

Internal Revenue Service:

"Salaries and expenses", $381,000;

"Revenue accounting and processing", $3,472,000;

"Compliance", $10,305,000;

Office of the Treasurer: "Salaries and expenses", $60,000;

United States Secret Service: "Salaries and expenses, guard force", $11,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", United States Secret Service, fiscal year 1966;*

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

"Operations", $9,500,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport", $54,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport", $62,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", $4,600,000;

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service", $861,000, *of which $55,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966;*

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", $336,000;

"Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service", $135,000, *of which $45,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966, and $90,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966;*

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", $33,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966;*

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"General operating expenses", $1,000,000;
"Medical and prosthetic research", $365,000;
"Medical care", $17,456,000;

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Civil Aeronautics Board: "Salaries and expenses", $240,000;
Civil Service Commission:
"Salaries and expenses", $528,000, *and in addition $15,000 may be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations"*;
"Limitation on administrative expenses, Employees life insurance fund" (increase of $6,200 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);
Farm Credit Administration: "Limitation on administrative expenses" (increase of $28,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: "Salaries and expenses", $1,500;
Federal Communications Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $346,000;
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:
"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (increase of $75,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);
"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation" (increase of $6,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);
Federal Maritime Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: "Salaries and expenses", $115,000;
Federal Power Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $300,000;
Federal Trade Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $312,500;
General Accounting Office: "Salaries and expenses", $535,000;
Intergovernmental commissions:
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;
Interstate Commerce Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $625,000;
National Labor Relations Board: "Salaries and expenses", $548,100;
National Mediation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $27,000;
Renegotiation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $30,000;
Small Business Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $150,000;
Smithsonian Institution:
"Salaries and expenses", $453,000;
"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", $66,000;
Tariff Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $46,000;
Tax Court of the United States: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;
United States Information Agency: "Salaries and expenses", $1,461,000;

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

Operating expenses:
"General operating expenses", $325,800, of which $4,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $1,400 from the motor vehicle parking account), $800 from the water fund, and $100 from the sanitary sewage works fund;
"Health and welfare", $920,500;
"Highways and traffic", $95,900, of which $78,000 shall be payable from the highway fund;
"Sanitary engineering", $253,000, of which $59,300 shall be payable from the water fund and $20,700 from the sanitary sewage works fund;

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1966.

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. ——. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1966, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

Analysis of Pay Increase Costs for the Fiscal Year 1966

Organizational unit	Increase in direct pay and other related costs		Net amount for payment to other appropriations	Absorption			Additional funds required	
	Direct pay	Related costs		Possible by administrative action	Requiring congressional action	Total	Previously requested House Doc. No. 383 [1]	Recommended in this document
Legislative branch:								
Public Law 89-301	$2,719,257	$56,314	$2,260	$304,011		$304,011		$2,668,220
Wage-board	160,690	33,710						
The Judiciary:								
Public Law 89-301	962,279	64,970		89,949		89,949		1,057,300
Administrative action	108,000	7,000						
Wage-board	4,100	900						
Executive Office of the President:								
The White House:								
Public Law 89-301	80,000	5,000		42,000	$85,000	127,000		
Administrative action	40,000	2,000						
Executive Mansion and Grounds:								
Administrative action	6,550	490		14,340		14,340		
Wage-board	6,790	510						
Bureau of the Budget:								
Public Law 89-301	168,900	12,200		51,010		51,010		131,000
Wage-board	850	60						
Council of Economic Advisers:								
Public Law 89-301	3,975	288		3,003		3,003		8,000
Administrative action	6,284	456						
National Aeronautics and Space Council:								
Public Law 89-301	7,698	700		10,200		10,200		
Administrative action	1,802							
National Security Council:								
Public Law 89-301	15,004	676		680		680		15,000
Office of Emergency Planning:								
Public Law 89-301	182,129	14,487		111,054	86,000	197,054		
Wage-board	408	30						

Office of Science and Technology:								
Public Law 89-301	13,995	1,050	----------	15,045	----------	15,045	----------	----------
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations:								
Public Law 89-301	7,600	600	----------	200	----------	200	----------	8,000
President's Committee on Consumer Interests:								
Public Law 89-301	5,300	400	----------	5,700	----------	5,700	----------	----------
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing:								
Public Law 89-301	2,960	225	----------	3,185	----------	3,185	----------	----------
Funds appropriated to the President:								
Disaster relief:								
Public Law 89-301	13,979	1,121	----------	15,100	----------	15,100	----------	----------
Expansion of defense production:								
Public Law 89-301	8,000	1,000	7,000	16,000	----------	16,000	----------	----------
Mutual defense and development:								
Military assistance:								
Public Law 89-301	838,000	72,000	----------	592,000	318,000	910,000	----------	----------
Economic assistance:								
Public Law 89-301	2,715,130	184,270	23,200	1,900,600	1,022,000	2,922,600	----------	----------
Office of Economic Opportunity:								
Public Law 89-301	404,026	30,302	----------	434,328	----------	434,328	----------	----------
Peace Corps:								
Public Law 89-301	299,320	16,325	----------	315,645	----------	315,645	----------	----------
Department of Agriculture:								
Public Law 89-301	21,071,570	1,689,789						
Administrative action	22,930	1,620	157,225	7,527,284	64,000	7,591,284	$2,790,000	13,051,000
Wage-board	460,100	29,000						
Department of Commerce:								
Public Law 89-301	6,756,711	472,737						
Public Law 89-132	122,000	45,000						
Administrative action	471,629	27,010	102,605	2,789,279	1,196,000	3,985,279	605,000	3,662,000
Wage-board	240,942	13,645						
Department of Defense—Military:								
Public Law 89-301	114,747,000	21,641,000						
Public Law 89-132	796,731,000	58,344,000						
Administrative action	80,000	5,000	20,656,000	221,234,000	----------	221,234,000	----------	863,521,000
Wage-board	67,691,000	4,860,000						

[1] Selective Service System included in House Doc. No. 380.

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1966—Continued

Organizational unit	Increase in direct pay and other related costs		Net amount for payment to other appropriations	Absorption			Additional funds required	
	Direct pay	Related costs		Possible by administrative action	Requiring congressional action	Total	Previously requested House Doc. No. 383 [1]	Recommended in this document
Department of Defense—Civil:								
Public Law 89-301	$5,467,065	$385,412						
Public Law 89-132	100,184							
Administrative action	6,844	242		$4,353,575	$283,000	$4,636,575	$3,379,000	$492,000
Wage-board	2,375,051	172,777						
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:								
Public Law 89-301	16,626,488	1,253,942						
Public Law 89-132	2,224,700	7,000						
Administration action	200,043	12,153	$22,000	10,102,762	8,133,000	18,235,762	162,500	3,042,000
Wage-board	1,068,287	25,649						
Department of Housing and Urban Development:								
Public Law 89-301	3,313,400	281,000		1,539,400	1,650,000	3,189,400		405,000
Department of the Interior:								
Public Law 89-301	10,844,182	849,301						
Administrative action	63,000	4,000		6,376,880	394,513	6,771,393	3,438,000	4,160,200
Wage-board	2,448,470	160,640						
Department of Justice:								
Public Law 89-301	7,025,687	733,470						
Public Law 89-132	39,980							
Administrative action	238,900	8,400		902,636	7,000	,636		7,439,000
Wage-board	282,287	19,912						
Department of Labor:								
Public Law 89-301	1,944,467	145,792	169,745	1,123,604	1,159,550	2,283,154		
Wage-board	21,142	2,008						
Post Office Department:								
Public Law 89-301	104,914,000	94,677,000		321,000		321,000	197,211,000	2,059,000

Department of State:								
Public Law 89-301	3,930,977	254,883						
Administrative action	102,345	6,815	37,000	1,499,757	1,540,300	3,040,057	----------	1,337,400
Wage-board	42,420	3,017						
Treasury Department:								
Public Law 89-301	17,578,695	1,220,236						
Public Law 89-132	11,733,930	342,370						
Administrative action	5,382	366	----------	3,363,462	11,000	3,374,462	----------	28,289,000
Wage-board	732,072	50,411						
Atomic Energy Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	2,060,051	137,071	----------	2,197,122	----------	2,197,122	----------	----------
Federal Aviation Agency:								
Public Law 89-301	10,787,640	806,285						
Wage-board	407,865	30,435	----------	2,416,225	----------	2,416,225	----------	9,616,000
General Services Administration:								
Public Law 89-301	2,106,500	147,600						
Wage-board	2,135,700	155,500	5,351,000	3,499,300	655,000	4,154,300	----------	5,742,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:								
Public Law 89-301	7,896,000	494,000						
Public Law 89-132	203,000	----------	----------	9,061,000	----------	9,061,000	----------	----------
Wage-board	437,000	31,000						
Veterans Administration:								
Public Law 89-301	21,083,912	1,863,632						
Administrative action	1,053,000	----------	----------	11,792,287	----------	11,792,287	----------	18,821,000
Wage-board	6,217,268	395,475						
Other independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	8,553	559						
Public Law 89-132	4,388	382	----------	23,012	----------	23,012	----------	----------
Wage-board	7,395	1,735						
Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	1,495	112	----------	1,607	----------	1,607	----------	----------
Civil Aeronautics Board:								
Public Law 89-301	217,550	16,309						
Wage-board	1,490	110	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Administrative action	4,541	----------						240,000

[1] Selective Service System included in House Doc. No. 380.

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1966—Continued

Organizational unit	Increase in direct pay and other related costs		Net amount for payment to other appropriations	Absorption			Additional funds required	
	Direct pay	Related costs		Possible by administrative action	Requiring congressional action	Total	Previously requested House Doc No. 383 [1]	Recommended in this document
Other independent agencies—Continued								
Civil Service Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	$853,951	$57,049	$1,100	$362,900	$21,200	$384,100	----------	$528,000
Commission of Fine Arts:								
Public Law 89-301	1,800	100	----------	1,900	----------	1,900	----------	----------
Commission on Civil Rights:								
Public Law 89-301	24,200	1,800	----------	----------	----------	----------	$26,000	----------
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	43,300	3,200	5,500	----------	----------	----------	52,000	----------
Export-Import Bank of Washington:								
Public Law 89-301	76,782	8,459	----------	85,704	----------	85,704	----------	----------
Wage-board	429	34						
Farm Credit Administration:								
Public Law 89-301	55,355	3,615	----------	33,000	28,000	61,000	----------	----------
Administrative action	1,845	185						
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review:								
Public Law 89-301	1,419	81	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,500
Federal Communications Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	370,800	24,030	----------	48,830	----------	48,830	----------	346,000
Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska:								
Public Law 89-301	2,576	505	----------	3,081	----------	3,081	----------	----------
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:								
Public Law 89-301	332,325	26,675	----------	278,000	81,000	359,000	----------	----------
Federal Maritime Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	68,500	5,000	----------	5,500	----------	5,500	----------	68,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service:								
Public Law 89-301	135,000	10,000	----------	30,000	----------	30,000	----------	115,000

Federal Power Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	280,900	20,060		3,640		3,640		300,000
Wage-board	2,500	180						
Federal Radiation Council:								
Public Law 89-301	1,500	120		1,620		1,620		
Federal Trade Commission:								
Public Law 89-310	307,928	25,215		22,953		22,953		312,500
Wage-board	2,169	141						
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	37,684	2,750		40,434		40,434		
General Accounting Office:								
Public Law 89-301	988,000	47,000		500,000		500,000		535,000
Historical and Memorial Commission:								
Civil War Centennial Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	850	70		920		920		
Indian Claims Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	6,000	1,000		7,000		7,000		
Intergovernmental Commissions:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations:								
Public Law 89-301	6,600	500		2,100		2,100		5,000
Appalachian Regional Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	2,076	135		20,978		20,978		
Administrative action	17,621	1,146						
Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico:								
Public Law 89-301	3,300	200		3,500		3,500		
Delaware River Basin Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	900	50		950		950		
Interstate Commerce Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	583,000	39,000						625,000
Wage-board	2,800	200						
National Capital Housing Authority:								
Public Law 89-301	33,069	2,261		62,039		62,039		
Wage-board	25,000	1,709						
National Capital Planning Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	16,600	1,400					18,000	

[1] Selective Service System included in House Doc No. 380.

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1966—Continued

Organizational unit	Increase in direct pay and other related costs		Net amount for payment to other appropriations	Absorption			Additional funds required	
	Direct pay	Related costs		Possible by administrative action	Requiring congressional action	Total	Previously requested House Doc. No. 383 [1]	Recommended in this document
Other independent agencies—Continued								
National Capital Transportation Agency:								
Public Law 89-301	$10,800	$900	----------	$11,700	----------	$11,700	----------	----------
National Commission on Food Marketing:								
Public Law 89-301	14,670	1,100	----------	15,770	----------	15,770	----------	----------
National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress:								
Public Law 89-301	1,594	120	----------	1,714	----------	1,714	----------	----------
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities:								
Public Law 89-301	5,200	370	----------	5,570	----------	5,570	----------	----------
National Labor Relations Board:								
Public Law 89-301	558,200	37,900	----------	51,100	----------	51,100	----------	$548,100
Wage-board	2,900	200						
National Mediation Board:								
Public Law 89-301	25,400	1,600	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	27,000
National Science Foundation:								
Public Law 89-301	212,300	17,240	----------	265,000	----------	265,000	----------	----------
Administrative action	31,940	2,600						
Wage-board	760	160						
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy:								
Public Law 89-301	506	38	----------	544	----------	544	----------	----------
President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice and on Crime in the District of Columbia:								
Public Law 89-301	4,850	350	----------	5,200	----------	5,200	----------	----------

Public Land Law Review Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	6,300	500		6,800		6,800		
Railroad Retirement Board:								
Public Law 89-301	344,670	23,830	$6,500	150,000	$225,000	375,000		
Renegotiation Board:								
Public Law 89-301	54,529	3,817		28,346		28,346		30,000
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:								
Public Law 89-301	11,869	1,187		13,056		13,056		
Securities and Exchange Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	342,200	23,900						
Wage-board	1,800	100		368,000		368,000		
Selective Service System:								
Public Law 89-301	137,000	8,840						
Public Law 89-132	185,000							
Administrative action	714,000	44,000		4,000		4,000	[1] $1,087,000	
Wage-board	2,000	160						
Small Business Administration:								
Public Law 89-301	822,850	66,750			739,600	739,600		150,000
Smithsonian Institution:								
Public Law 89-301	315,341	29,379						
Wage-board	177,400	12,400		15,520		15,520		519,000
Subversive Activities Control Board:								
Public Law 89-301	7,456	540		7,996		7,996		
Tariff Commission:								
Public Law 89-301	71,000	5,000						
Wage-board	900	100		31,000		31,000		46,000
Tax Court of the United States:								
Public Law 89-301	34,660	2,433		25,093		25,093		12,000
Tennessee Valley Authority:								
Administrative action	1,797,000	571,000		2,368,000		2,368,000		
United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:								
Public Law 89-301	60,000	3,000		63,000		63,000		
United States Information Agency:								
Public Law 89-301	1,316,643	92,732	145,769	94,144		94,144		1,461,000
Water Resources Council:								
Public Law 89-301	2,900	200		3,100		3,100		

[1] Selective Service System included in House Doc. No. 380.

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1966—Continued

Organizational unit	Increase in direct pay and other related costs		Net amount for payment to other appropriations	Absorption			Additional funds required	
	Direct pay	Related costs		Possible by administrative action	Requiring congressional action	Total	Previously requested House Doc. No. 383 [1]	Recommended in this document
District of Columbia:								
Public Law 89-301	$1,930,055	$131,944	$115,314	$649,037		$649,037	$633,400	$1,595,200
Wage-board	657,223	43,101						
Grand total	1,279,289,999	193,744,247	26,802,218	299,746,981	$17,699,163	317,446,144	209,401,900	972,988,420
Summary of Public Laws:								
Public Law 89-301	377,354,903	128,266,003	26,802,218	299,746,981	17,699,163	317,446,144	209,401,900	972,988,420
Public Law 89-132	811,344,182	58,738,752						
Administrative action	4,973,706	694,483						
Wage-board	85,617,208	6,045,009						
Grand total	1,279,289,999	193,744,247	26,802,218	299,746,981	17,699,163	317,446,144	209,401,900	972,988,420
Deduct amounts out of District of Columbia funds	2,587,278	175,045	115,314	649,037		649,037	633,400	1,595,200
Net total	1,276,702,721	193,569,202	26,686,904	299,097,944	17,699,163	316,797,107	208,768,500	971,393,220
Deduct payments between accounts			26,686,904	26,686,904		26,686,904		
Total from Federal funds	1,276,702,721	193,569,202		272,411,040	17,699,163	290,110,203	208,768,500	971,393,220

[1] Selective Service System included in House Doc. No. 380.

○

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
OR INFORMATION ONLY;
T TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued March 28, 1966
For actions of March 25, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 52

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....20
Agriculture.....15
Appropriations.....1,2
Cattle hides.....2
Civil defense.....10
Committee assignments....9
Community action.....30
Consumers.....18,24
Daylight saving time.....3
Education.....19
Electrification.....12,28
Food.....6,7
Food and drugs.....14
Foreign aid.....7
Forestry.....1,16
Housing.....21,30
Indemnity payments.....26
Information.....17,23
Intergovernmental relations.....8
Land-grant colleges.....19
Libraries.....17
Milk.....4
Pay costs.....1
Personnel.....25
Pesticides.....26
Poverty.....22,30
Research animals.....29
Rural community development.....5
School lunch.....4
Stockpiling.....11
Water.....13,27
World food.....6,7

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported supplemental appropriation bill. Sen. Proxmire criticized school milk budget cut. Sen. Pearson introduced and discussed bill to provide indemnity payments for commodities damaged by use of pesticide chemicals.

HOUSE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. The House Appropriations Committee reported the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1966 (H. R. 14012, on H. Rept. 1349) which includes funds for this Department as follows: (1) Appropriations for pay costs pursuant to Public Law 89-301 and wage board increases, $15,841,000 and a transfer of $64,000, and (2) Supplemental Appropriations for the Forest Service for fighting forest fires, $7,500,000. The House report provides the same amounts for this Department as requested for these purposes in H. Documents 383 and 405. For details of the amounts requested by agencies see Digest Nos. 29 and 30 and 41.

2. CATTLE HIDES; APPROPRIATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states that on Thurs., Mar. 24, the Agriculture Committee "adopted two committee resolutions, one which pertains to export restrictions on cattle hides, calf, and kip skins; the other expresses the committee's views on Budget Bureau's proposed cutback in agricultural appropriations." p. D251

SENATE

3. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME. Conferees were appointed on S. 1404, the proposed Uniform Time Act of 1966 (p. 6472). House conferees have already been appointed.

4. MILK. Sen. Proxmire criticized the budget cut for the school milk program. p. 6413

Received Ga. and Calif. Legislature resolutions urging additional appropriations for the school milk and school lunch programs. p. 6391

Sen. Dodd was added as a cosponsor of S. 2921, to provide a special milk program for children. p. 6404

Sen. Mondale inserted a Land O'Lakes Creamery resolution supporting his proposed national milk sanitation bill. p. 6441

5. RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Mondale criticized an editorial which he stated leaves the empression "that Secretary Freeman is finding little support in the Congress for his rural community development legislation." p. 6463

6. FOOD. Sen. Mondale inserted Secretary Freeman's speech to the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation reviewing world food problems. pp. 6456-8

Sen. Bartlett was added as a cosponsor of S. 2995, the proposed Emergency Food Reserves Act of 1966. p. 6404

7. FOREIGN AID. Sens. Lausche and Tydings commended Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's visit to the U. S., and reviewed recent U. S. economic assistance to India, including food supplies. pp. 6461, 6488-93

Sen. Mansfield commended establishment of the Asian Development Bank to aid in the economic development of Asia. pp. 6429-30

Sen. Montoya reviewed problems in the economic development of Latin American, including agriculture, and suggested ways the U. S. may assist in their economic development. pp. 6481-8

8. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Sen. Muskie reviewed problems of intergovernmental relations, proposed certain steps for immediate and long-range action, and inserted the recommendations by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. pp. 6500-12

9. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Sen. Long, La., resigned from the Foreign Relations Committee and was assigned to the Commerce Committee. Sen. McGee resigned from the Commerce Committee and was assigned to the Foreign Relations Committee. p. 6388

10. CIVIL DEFENSE. Received from Defense Dept. a report on civil defense functions for 1965. p. 6389

11. STOCKPILE. Received from OEP a statistical supplement, stockpile reports for the 6-month period ended Dec. 31, 1965. p. 6389

89TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1349

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

MARCH 25, 1966.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14012]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

SCOPE AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee considered budget requests for appropriations aggregating $2,813,552,168 and a contract authority request of $30,000,000 for the new rent supplement program, submitted in House Documents Nos. 380, 383, 405, 414, and 415. This sum excludes $838,850 for Senate housekeeping items on which initiative is left to the other body. The President also asked for a number of provisions transferring funds between appropriations, increasing limitations, and the like, mostly to accommodate greater absorptions of increased pay costs dealt with largely in Title II.

The Committee bill totals $2,564,872,568 in appropriations, and $12,000,000 in contract authority for the rent supplement program, representing a net total reduction of $248,679,600 from the budget estimates for appropriations and $18,000,000 less on contract authority. While there are many changes—virtually all being reductions—from the individual budget requests, the net total cut is very substantially accounted for by the $242,000,000 deleted from the

$342,000,000 request for a repayable advance to the trust fund for health insurance for the aged on the evidence that $100,000,000 is an entirely adequate amount as a contingency fund. Otherwise, the Committee changes are about a standoff.

Some perspective about the lack of amenability of the totals to further substantial reductions can be gained from analysis of the several types of requests submitted.

$552,600,000, or 21% of the bill, is for mandatory-type expenditures under laws enacted prior to the last session—requests involving little or no discretion at this point. Public assistance matching grants and veterans compensation and pensions account for nearly all of it.

$1,171,400,000, or some 46% of the bill is for increased pay rates enacted in the last session for military and civilian personnel.

These two categories account for roughly two-thirds of the total.

$694,300,000—another 27%—is assigned in the bill to legislation—other than pay acts—enacted in the last session. And about half of that—precisely, $335,700,000—is nondiscretionary at this stage, for additional veterans compensation and pensions and to pay off the extra obligations incurred under an overallotment formula written into the new elementary and secondary education appropriation last year. Another $125,800,000 is associated with health insurance for the aged. $105,000,000 is to begin paying military service credits to the Social Security trust fund.

$146,600,000—the remaining 6%—is for an assortment of programs. The postal service, where the volume is increasing, is $81,000,000. Another $45,000,000 is to replenish the disaster relief fund.

These sums supplement gross appropriations for the current fiscal year 1966, including the permanent appropriations that recur automatically, of approximately $125,900,000,000, including the $13,175,000,000 defense supplemental which cleared earlier this week. All supplemental budget requests considered in connection with this bill were either specifically contemplated and encompassed in the fiscal 1966 totals reflected in the fiscal 1967 budget or are chargeable to the allowance for contingencies which those totals included. Thus they do not exceed previously announced budget totals.

More details on the Committee's recommendation are set out in the several individual chapter explanations.

Report page No.	Chapter	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
		TITLE I			
4	I	District of Columbia	$2,300,000	$1,250,000	−$1,050,000
6	II	Independent Offices	380,681,000	348,280,000	−32,401,000
9	III	Interior	23,350,000	22,495,000	−855,000
14	IV	Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	−203,914,000
22	V	Legislative	17,000	107,000	+90,000
24	VI	Public Works	16,024,000	15,570,000	−454,000
27	VII	State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	7,922,000	7,260,000	−662,000
32	VIII	Treasury, Post Office	296,010,000	294,010,000	−2,000,000
34	IX	Claims and judgments	10,251,798	10,251,798	
		Total, title I	1,842,997,798	1,601,751,798	−241,246,000
		TITLE II			
35		Increased pay costs	[1] 970,554,370	963,120,770	−7,433,600
39		Minority views.			
		Total, title II	970,554,370	963,120,770	−7,433,600
		Grand total	2,813,552,168	2,564,872,568	−248,679,600

[1] Excludes $838,850 pertaining to Senate operations not considered by the Committee. In addition, estimates for various chapters in Title I, above, include a total of $208,768,500 for increased pay costs.

CHAPTER I

SUBCOMMITTEE

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, KENTUCKY, *CHAIRMAN*

ROBERT N. GIAIMO, CONNECTICUT
NEAL SMITH, IOWA
JOHN J. McFALL, CALIFORNIA
GLENN R. DAVIS, WISCONSIN
JOSEPH M. McDADE, PENNSYLVANIA

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Committee considered budget estimates totaling $2,300,000 in Federal funds and $3,055,000 in District of Columbia funds, submitted in House Documents Numbered 383 and 405. The estimates requested in House Document Numbered 383 include the request for an additional Federal payment as well as appropriations in the amount of $1,459,800. The remaining $1,595,200 for pay costs submitted in House Document Numbered 405 are included in Title II of the accompanying bill.

FEDERAL PAYMENT

The Committee has approved an increased Federal payment of $1,250,000 to the general fund of the District of Columbia which will provide a total of $44,250,000 for the current fiscal year. This allowance is $1,050,000 less than requested. Based on revised estimates of revenues furnished by District officials on March 17 and the appropriations recommended in this bill, as well as those enacted during the last session of the Congress, it is estimated there will be a surplus of approximately $38,000 remaining in the general fund at the end of the fiscal year. A reserve has also been continued to cover corporation refunds, indefinite appropriations, and miscellaneous items.

OPERATING EXPENSES

The Committee recommends a total of $1,459,800 in this chapter for Public Safety and Parks and Recreation, payable from District of Columbia funds. This allowance is the full amount of the budget request for financing the costs of pay increases under Public Law 89–301 and wage-board increases. These funds also provide for the overtime pay of policemen and firemen as authorized by Public Law 89–282. Additional funds for classified pay and wage-board increases totaling $1,595,200 are included in Title II as requested.

The Committee has also approved the extension of the tactical force of the Police Department for the period April 1, to June 30, 1966, as requested. This program was authorized for a nine-month period on a temporary and emergency basis last year and the Committee reiterates its position stated in the conference report on the regular bill for fiscal year 1966 that this action in no way constitutes a precedent for future estimates for this purpose. Continued overtime work by existing personnel destroys the efficiency and flexibility of the force and detracts from its ability to respond to emergencies. This matter will be explored very carefully during the hearings on the regular budget for fiscal year 1967.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
383	Federal payment to District of Columbia	$2,300,000	$1,250,000	−$1,050,000
383	Operating expenses:			
	Public safety	*(1,249,200)*	*(1,249,200)*	
	Parks and recreation	*(210,600)*	*(210,600)*	
	Total, operating expenses	*(1,459,800)*	*(1,459,800)*	

CHAPTER II

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOE L. EVINS, TENNESSEE, *CHAIRMAN*

EDWARD P. BOLAND, MASSACHUSETTS
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, ILLINOIS
ROBERT N. GIAIMO, CONNECTICUT
CHARLES R. JONAS, NORTH CAROLINA
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, OHIO
JOHN J. RHODES, ARIZONA

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Selective Service System

salaries and expenses

An appropriation of $10,180,000 is recommended for additional expenses of the Selective Service System arising from an increase in the number of inductions the System is expected to provide during the current fiscal year, and to cover the cost of pay increases provided by law for both military and civilian employees last session. A substantial increase was granted in the regular appropriation bill in anticipation of increased workload. Inductions scheduled for April, however, have declined over projections made only recently. The Committee has taken these factors into account in reducing the request by $2,501,000.

Veterans Administration

The bill contains $288,000,000, the entire amount requested, for compensation and pensions. Of this additional amount $151,771,000 is attributable to five new legislative enactments last session. These increased certain disability compensation rates; provided for a death gratuity payment up to $5,000 to beneficiaries of veterans who died in service between January 1, 1957, and September 28, 1965; and made other liberalizations in benefits. The balance of $136,229,000 is due to increases in the average rates payable and in caseload.

The Committee also recommends the supplemental budget request of $5,000,000 for readjustment benefits. This additional amount is related to legislation enacted last session which increased the monthly payment to war-orphans in training and extended the time available for seriously disabled veterans to pursue vocational rehabilitation training.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

A supplemental appropriation of $45,000,000 is recommended to replenish the President's disaster relief fund for use to assist States and local governments in major disasters. This is $30,000,000 less than the budget estimate, but is expected to be adequate to cover all

obligation requirements in the current fiscal year. There have been twelve new major disaster declarations since August 16, 1965, when additional funds were last provided. As a consequence the unobligated balance has declined to less than $13,500,000 at the present time.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Rent Supplement Program

The Committee recommends $100,000 for payments and $12,000,000 for contract authorization to implement the new rent supplement program authorized by Section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. The budget estimate proposed an authorization of $30,000,000 but the Committee is of the opinion that the lesser amount is adequate to initiate the program for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Subsequent to consideration of this proposition by the Congress last fall, much has been done to clarify issues raised at that time. Rent supplement payments will be made to owners or developers of certain private housing in order to help make more housing available to low-income persons. The Secretary has clearly stated that only those of low income will be helped. In no case will income limits be above those established for low-rent public housing. An asset limitation has been set at $2,000 for low-income families, or $5,000 in the case of the elderly.

The success of this program is dependent in great measure on acceptance by local communities. The recent housing legislation places great emphasis on the value of workable programs at the local level. To facilitate the establishment of the rent supplement program, the Committee has included language in the bill limiting the use of funds under this program to those projects which are either part of a workable program or which have been officially approved by the local community concerned. This action does not restrict but serves to strengthen local planning and insures participation similar to that required in other programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES			
	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM			
380	Salaries and expenses	$12, 681, 000	$10, 180, 000	−$2, 501, 000
	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
383	Compensation and pensions	288, 000, 000	288, 000, 000	
383	Readjustment benefits	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	
	Total, Veterans' Administration	293, 000, 000	293, 000, 000	
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
383	Disaster relief	75, 000, 000	45, 000, 000	−30, 000, 000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
380	Rent supplement program:			
	Appropriation for rent payments		100, 000	+100, 000
	Annual contract authorization for grants	*(30, 000, 000)*	*(12, 000, 000)*	*(−18, 000, 000)*
	Total, chapter II	380, 681, 000	348, 280, 000	−32, 401, 000

CHAPTER III

SUBCOMMITTEE

WINFIELD K. DENTON, INDIANA, *CHAIRMAN*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OHIO
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, WASHINGTON
JOHN O. MARSH, JR., VIRGINIA
BEN REIFEL, SOUTH DAKOTA
JOSEPH M. McDADE, PENNSYLVANIA

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,495,000, of which $1,000,000 is to cover the costs of emergency fire suppression and rehabilitation of burned-over land incurred during the summer of 1965, and to meet anticipated expenses for similar activities for the remainder of the current fiscal year; and $495,000 is for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $755,000, of which $186,000 is to cover fire suppression costs incurred through December 31, 1965, and anticipated costs for these activities for the remainder of the current fiscal year; and $569,000 is for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,028,000, a reduction of $279,000 below the budget request. The amount of $245,000 is for emergency fire suppression expenses incurred during the summer of 1965, and to meet similar anticipated expenses during the remainder of the current fiscal year; $741,000 is for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301; and $42,000 is for compensation for over-time work by park police as authorized by Public Law 89–282.

H. Rept. 1349, 89–2——2

The Committee does not recommend approval of the request of $279,000 for initial staffing of 13 newly authorized park areas. Most of the land for these new park areas has not yet been acquired, and what appears to be adequate funding for this purpose has been provided in 1967 budget estimate. In the opinion of the Committee, a delay of several months in the funding of this activity will cause no undue hardships.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $827,000, a reduction of $97,000 below the budget request. The amount of $724,000 is for increases for wage board employees, and $103,000 is for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301.

The Committee does not recommend approval of the request of $97,000 for the initial maintenance staff at nine new park areas. Funding is included in the 1967 budget estimate for this purpose. The urgency of this supplemental is not apparent to the Committee.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $900,000, a reduction of $269,000 below the budget request, to provide funds for the reconstruction of roads and other facilities damaged by hurricane, flood, storm, and other uncontrollable causes. Estimates for this type of damage to park service facilities have tended to be more than ample for the restoration of the damaged facilities. In the event the recommended amount is not sufficient to cover all damage, fiscal year 1967 construction funds should be available in the near future for any remaining work that cannot be financed with this amount.

CONSTRUCTION—(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,500,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under the contract authority granted in the Federal Aid Highway Act.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATION OF RESOURCES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $148,000, a reduction of $55,000 below the budget request. The amount of $148,000 is for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301.

The Committee does not recommend approval of the request for $55,000 for pesticides research. $500,000 was appropriated for this activity in 1966 and $720,000 is included in the 1967 budget estimate.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

management and investigation of resources

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $658,000, a reduction of $105,000 below the budget estimate. Of this amount, $478,000 is for civilian pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301, and $180,000 is for wage board increases.

The Committee does not recommend approval of the request for $105,000 for pesticides research. The sum of $2,065,000 was appropriated for this activity in 1966 and $2,480,000 is included in the 1967 budget estimate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

forest protection and utilization

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,290,000, which includes $7, 500,000 for fighting forest fires and $2,135, 000 for increased pay and associated costs resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–301 under Forest Land Management; $610,000 under Forest Research for increased pay and associated costs; and $45,000 under State and Private Forestry Cooperation for increased pay costs.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $18,000 for pay and associated costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301.

The Committee does not recommend approval of the request for $50,000 for printing costs. The excess costs for this item should be absorbed within funds otherwise available under this appropriation item for 1966.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Transitional Grants to Alaska

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $876,000 to complete payment of grants authorized by Public Law 88–311, approved May 27, 1964, to assist the State of Alaska in recovering from the earthquake of March 27, 1964.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT			
383	Management of lands and resources	$1,495,000	$1,495,000	
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS			
383	Resources management	755,000	755,000	
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE			
383	Management and protection	1,307,000	1,028,000	−$279,000
383	Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	924,000	827,000	−97,000
383	Construction	1,169,000	900,000	−269,000
383	Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	5,500,000	5,500,000	
	Total, National Park Service	8,900,000	8,255,000	−645,000
	FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE			
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES			
383	Management and investigation of resources	203,000	148,000	−55,000

	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE			
383	Management and investigation of resources	763, 000	658, 000	−105, 000
	Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	966, 000	806, 000	−160, 000
	Total, Department of the Interior	12, 116, 000	11, 311, 000	−805, 000
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	FOREST SERVICE			
	Forest protection and utilization:			
383	Forest land management	9, 635, 000	9, 635, 000	
383	Forest research	610, 000	610, 000	
383	State and private forestry cooperation	45, 000	45, 000	
	Total, forest protection and utilization	10, 290, 000	10, 290, 000	
	Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	10, 290, 000	10, 290, 000	
	NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION			
383	Salaries and expenses	68, 000	18, 000	−50, 000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
383	Transitional grants to Alaska	876, 000	876, 000	
	Total, chapter III	23, 350, 000	22, 495, 000	−855, 000

CHAPTER IV

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida
ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Oregon
BILLIE S. FARNUM, Michigan
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin
ROBERT H. MICHEL, Illinois
GARNER E. SHRIVER, Kansas

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

The bill includes $1,000,000 for expenses of carrying out the Department of Labor's responsibilities under the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. This Act authorizes adjustment assistance for workers in the automotive industry who are determined to have been "dislocated" as a result of changes in tariffs made by that Act. This assistance is in the form of weekly allowances and in some cases relocation allowances, as well as special assistance in finding new jobs or assistance in entering training programs. The request was for $10,000,000 to remain available until expended. The Committee could see no reason for deviating from the standard practice of making appropriations of this type on an annual basis and has therefore limited the availability of these funds to the fiscal year 1966. The Department estimated that $1,400,000 would be needed in 1966. In the view of the Committee, this estimate was based on overly optimistic forecasts of the speed with which action will be taken on petitions.

Both the funds requested and the funds included in the bill would be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen." The use of funds under that appropriation is somewhat affected by the general unemployment situation. The appropriation for 1966 was made at a time when estimates of unemployment were higher than the rate which has actually developed. As a result, there is a surplus of funds in the appropriation and all three Department of Labor appropriations which appear in the bill are transfers from this surplus, with the exception of $206,100, which is by transfer from the Unemployment Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The bill includes $1,028,000, a reduction of $15,000 from the request. Of the amount allowed, $238,000 is to cover about half of the increased salary costs under Public Law 89–301 and $790,000 is to enable the Department to carry out its responsibilities in connection with the admission and employment of immigrant aliens under the 1965

amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. The reduction of $15,000 represents funds requested for the Office of Manpower Administrator. The Committee sees absolutely no reason for a layer of administrative responsibility for this program between the Bureau of Employment Security and the Secretary.

Wage and Labor Standards

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The bill includes $614,000, the amount of the request, to cover slightly over 50% of the increased salary costs under Public Law 89–301 and a portion of the cost of administering the Service Contract Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–286). The balance of these costs is being absorbed by some reduction in the regular activities of the Division.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The bill includes $950,000, the amount of the request. These funds are to enable the Office of Education to initiate the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. Included is $850,000 for advances for State and non-profit private student loan insurance programs and $100,000 for interest payments for about 15,000 qualified students.

VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

The bill includes $50,000, the amount of the request, to establish a Federal Insurance Reserve Fund to insure loans for vocational students as provided for in the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The bill includes $184,000,000, the amount of the request. These funds are limited to assistance for educationally deprived children under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for which $775,000,000 has already been appropriated for fiscal year 1966. The appropriation, which is already available, was included in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966. At the time that appropriation was acted on it was impossible to estimate, with any assurance of accuracy, the fund requirements for this new program. Congress, therefore, included in that appropriation a provision permitting allocation of funds on the basis of the maximum authorization, realizing that a supplemental appropriation would have to be made if demands exceeded $775,000,000. It now appears that even the additional $184,000,000 may fall short of providing sufficient funds to finance all approvable applications.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The bill includes $21,300,000, a reduction of $2,900,000 from the budget request of $24,200,000. This request was in two parts, one included in House Document No. 380 and the other in House Document No. 383. The former request was for $13,200,000 to start the National Teacher Corps Program and the latter request was for $11,000,000 to fund the library program under Title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Committee has approved $10,000,000 for the National Teacher Corps; the $11,000,000 requested for the library program; and has added $300,000 to be transferred to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials as authorized by Part C of Title II of the Act. While the President's budget for fiscal year 1967 requests an appropriation for the last mentioned activity, there was no request for supplemental funds for 1966 to start this part of the program at the same time the other parts were to be started. In the opinion of the Committee, the addition of these funds will provide for a better rounded program.

The bill includes two language provisions which apply limitations on the use of funds for the National Teacher Corps. The first would limit the use of Federal funds for teachers' salaries to 90%, thus requiring that a minimum of 10% of such salary cost be borne by the State and/or local school system benefiting by the assignment of teachers under the program. The second would provide that no Federal funds could be spent on any program in a local school system until it had been approved by the State educational agency. The Committee believes that the inclusion of these provisions will result in a sounder program than a 100% Federally financed program operating directly with local schools to the virtual exclusion of the State educational agency. The Committee realizes that few, and perhaps no teachers will actually be assigned to schools until next fiscal year, but it feels that these provisions should be carried in this bill to make the intent clear and thus make it easier for all concerned to make their plans for the program.

While both the library program and the National Teacher Corps are authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, they are two separate and distinct programs. The bill, therefore, carries them in two separate paragraphs, the first under the heading "Higher educational activities" and the other under the heading "National Teacher Corps".

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The last session of Congress appropriated $347,000,000 to carry out the provisions of Public Law 874, as amended. This amount was estimated by the Office of Education to be sufficient to cover 100% of entitlements under the law as it then stood. During the latter days of the last session of Congress, Public Law 874 was further amended and further liberalized. Largely as a result of this action, the appropriation will lack approximately $41,000,000 of being sufficient to cover 100% of entitlements. The Committee thus recommends the inclusion of $41,000,000.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

GRANTS TO STATES

The bill includes $39,000,000, the amount of the request. This is based on a mathematical calculation of the amount necessary to carry out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1965 which provide for increased allotments and an increased rate of Federal sharing in the cost of the program under Section 2.

Public Health Service

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The bill includes $4,175,000, the amount of the request. These funds are limited to initiating programs authorized by the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 which authorizes a maximum appropriation of $11,000,000 for fiscal year 1966.

Social Security Administration

PAYMENT TO TRUST FUNDS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

The bill includes $125,800,000, a reduction of $242,000,000 from the request for $367,800,000. These funds were requested to provide an advance of $342,000,000 to the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, and $25,800,000 to reimburse the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses incurred under the program to provide hospital insurance benefits for aged individuals not covered under the Social Security or Railroad Retirement programs. The advance of $342,000,000 is authorized under Section 1844 of the Social Security Amendments of 1965. However, the justifications submitted to the Committee stated, "Current forecasts indicate that it is unlikely that substantial withdrawals from the $342,000,000 fund will be required during the 18-month period of its proposed availability." Hearings with the Social Security Administration officials further substantiated this statement. Some funds will be necessary in order to assure prompt payment of benefits during the early months of the program should benefits exceed payments into the trust fund. Especially since this is a repayable advance, the Committee believes the appropriation of $100,000,000, as a contingency fund, is appropriate.

PAYMENT FOR MILITARY SERVICE CREDITS

The bill includes $105,000,000, the amount of the request. This will provide the first installment to reimburse the Social Security trust funds for past and future benefit payments resulting from noncontributory credit for military service. Section 217(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, requires such reimbursement over a period of 50 years beginning in fiscal year 1966.

Welfare Administration

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The bill includes $381,000,000, the amount of the request, which would make a total of $3,603,000,000 available for this purpose for fiscal year 1966. When Congress acted on the regular annual bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare for fiscal year 1966, it reduced the request for grants to states for public assistance by $242,100,000 on the basis that we have been appropriating hundreds of millions of additional dollars every year for the past few years for programs that are aimed at combating dependency, and the outlook for a reduction in the rate of unemployment was better than it had been for a long time. Of course, unemployment rates have gone to even lower levels than was anticipated when Congress acted on the original appropriation for 1966. Yet, in the face of this fact, the request for a supplemental appropriation is not only to restore the reduction made by Congress last year but for an additional amount of approximately $140,000,000. Of course, this is purely a mathematical calculation and nothing can be done under the law but to pay the bill.

Special Institutions

The bill includes $24,000 for the appropriation "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses," and $216,000 for "Howard University, salaries and expenses," the amount of the request in both instances. These appropriations are similar to those made during the last several years when salary increases were provided for Federal employees. They provide for salary increases comparable to those granted under Public Law 89–301 and social security premium rates in line with changes under Public Law 89–97. Nothing else is included in the requests or the recommended appropriations.

Office of the Secretary

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The bill includes $13,000 and authorization to use $53,000 from the old age and survivors insurance trust fund, a reduction of $14,000 and $15,000, respectively, from the request for $27,000 and $68,000. The request was for $36,000 for increased pay costs under Public Law 89–301 and $59,000 for state merit systems workload related to requirements under new legislation during the last year. The Committee has allowed $30,000 for the latter purpose which it believes will be sufficient to adequately provide for the additional workload.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Limitation on Salaries and Expenses

The bill includes $1,075,000, the amount of the request. This amount includes $225,000 to cover pay act costs and $850,000 for handling work created for the Railroad Retirement Board by the enactment of the 1965 amendments to the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts. The Board estimates that this additional workload will amount to approximately $965,000 but it is expected that $115,000 of these costs can be absorbed as a result of savings in other operations.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY			
383	Trade adjustment activities	[1] (*$10,000,000*)	[1] (*$1,000,000*)	(*−$9,000,000*)
383	Salaries and expenses	[1] (*1,043,000*)	[1] (*1,028,000*)	(*−15,000*)
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS			
383	Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses	[1] (*614,000*)	[1] (*614,000*)	(----------)
	Total, Department of Labor	[1] (*11,657,000*)	[1] (*2,642,000*)	(*−9,015,000*)
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
383	Expansion and improvement of vocational education	950,000	950,000	----------
383	Vocational student loan insurance fund	50,000	50,000	----------
383	Elementary and secondary educational activities	184,000,000	184,000,000	----------
383	Higher educational activities	11,000,000	11,300,000	+300,000
380	National Teacher Corps	13,200,000	10,000,000	−3,200,000
	Payments to school districts	----------	41,000,000	+41,000,000
	VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION			
383	Grants to States	39,000,000	39,000,000	----------

	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE			
383	National Library of Medicine	4, 175, 000	4, 175, 000	----------
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
383	Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged	367, 800, 000	125, 800, 000	−242, 000, 000
383	Payment for military service credits	105, 000, 000	105, 000, 000	----------
	WELFARE ADMINISTRATION			
383	Grants to States for public assistance	381, 000, 000	381, 000, 000	----------
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS			
383	Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses	24, 000	24, 000	----------
383	Howard University, salaries and expenses	216, 000	216, 000	----------
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
383	Office of Field Administration, salaries and expenses	27, 000	13, 000	−14, 000
	Trust funds	*(68, 000)*	*(53, 000)*	*(−15, 000)*
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1, 106, 442, 000	902, 528, 000	−203, 914, 000
	RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD			
383	Salaries and expenses (trust fund transfer)	*(1, 075, 000)*	*(1, 075, 000)*	(----------)
	Total, chapter IV	1, 106, 442, 000	902, 528, 000	−203, 914, 000

[1] To be derived by transfer.

CHAPTER V

SUBCOMMITTEE

GEORGE W. ANDREWS, ALABAMA, *CHAIRMAN*

TOM STEED, OKLAHOMA
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OHIO
JOHN M. SLACK, JR., WEST VIRGINIA
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., GEORGIA
ODIN LANGEN, MINNESOTA
BEN REIFEL, SOUTH DAKOTA

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The usual sum is included to pay the customary gratituities to the widows of three Members of the House who have passed away since the last enactment in this connection.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

The amount of $17,000 is recommended to supplement the usual, but this year insufficient, annual allotment for emergency snow removal on the Capitol grounds caused by the big blizzard at the end of January, 1966.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH[1]			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
	Gratuities to widows of deceased Members		$90,000	+$90,000
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS			
415	Capitol grounds	$17,000	17,000	
	Total, chapter V	17,000	107,000	+90,000

[1] Budget estimates of $838,850 in H. Doc. 405, pertaining to Senate operations were not considered and are therefore omitted from this table.

CHAPTER VI

SUBCOMMITTEE

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio, *Chairman*

JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Corps of Engineers—Civil

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

The Committee recommends $7,000,000, a reduction of $350,000 below the budget estimate. This amount will provide $4,230,000 for repair and restoration of navigation facilities damaged by Hurricane Betsy; $920,000 for salary increases as authorized by Public Law 89–301 and Public Law 89–132; and $1,850,000 for the cost of wage board rate increases effective during the period October 1, 1964 thru June 30, 1966. The reduction of $350,000 has been effected in this latter item. It is believed this amount can be absorbed within available funds without any impairment of the planned operation and maintenance program.

FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION EMERGENCIES

The Committee recommends the budget request of $7,750,000 consisting of $4,235,000 to cover the cost of emergency activities associated with Hurricane Betsy and $3,515,000 to provide a contingency fund to meet anticipated needs during the 1966 spring flood season.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government

OPERATING EXPENSES

The Committee has approved $300,000, a reduction of $104,000 below the estimate, to meet the increased pay and associated costs authorized by Public Law 89–301 and overtime compensation for

police and firemen resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–282. It is believed that the recommended reduction can be absorbed by the Canal Zone Government within available funds.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has approved the budget estimate of $520,000 to permit continuation of construction of the Jonesboro-Idalia Line in southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas required to provide service to several municipalities served by the Southwestern Power Administration. $1,820,000 has been obligated for construction of the line to date and an additional $560,000 is being made available for the current year from unobligated balances. The remaining funds to complete construction of the line, $360,000, are included in the 1967 budget.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	PUBLIC WORKS			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY			
	CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL			
383	Operation and maintenance, general	$7,350,000	$7,000,000	−$350,000
383	Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies	7,750,000	7,750,000	
	Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil	15,100,000	14,750,000	−350,000
	THE PANAMA CANAL			
	CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT			
383	Operating expenses	404,000	300,000	−104,000
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
383	Construction	520,000	520,000	
	Total, chapter VI	16,024,000	15,570,000	−454,000

CHAPTER VII

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., West Virginia
NEAL SMITH, Iowa
JOHN J. FLYNT, Georgia
CHARLES S. JOELSON, New Jersey
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, California
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Michigan

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

The sum of $450,000, a decrease of $50,000 from the amount of the budget estimate, is provided in the bill to finance unanticipated emergencies arising in the conduct of foreign affairs.

PAYMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The amount of the budget estimate, $45,000, is included in the accompanying bill to finance certain changes made by the Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1965 of annuities for personnel who retired before October 1960. This amount represents the additional cost for four months of fiscal year 1966.

International Commissions

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

The Committee is of the opinion that the request for $32,000 to provide funds for the preparation of the claims of American citizens against Canada for damage caused in 1951–1952 by high waters to property located along the south shore of Lake Ontario is not necessary. This matter can continue to be handled within the appropriation for "Salaries and Expenses" and this appropriation.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

Language as requested in House Document No. 383 is included in the bill to increase the limitation in the 1966 appropriation act on the total amount that may be paid to expert witnesses by the sum of $25,000.

Federal Prison System

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

The bill includes $475,000 additional to cover the increased costs of keeping Federal prisoners in non-Federal jails.

The costs under this item are getting entirely out of hand. Testimony before the Committee disclosed that payments as high as $22.99 per day per inmate have been made. The Committee expects the proper departmental officials to remedy this situation immediately.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent Office

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Also included in the accompanying bill is $1,000,000, the amount of the budget estimate, to provide $605,000 to cover increased pay and associated costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301 and $395,000 for printing an additional 5,000 patents for issuance under the acceleration provisions of Public Law 89–83.

THE JUDICIARY

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services

SALARIES OF JUDGES

An additional amount of $200,000 is contained in the bill for the compensation of judges. This amount, together with the regular appropriation of $14,500,000, will provide for the payment of salaries to an average of 466 judges.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

The full amount of the budget estimate, $1,165,000, is recommended to cover increases in the attendance fee and subsistence allowance of jurors as authorized by Public Law 89–165.

RELATED AGENCIES

Commission on Civil Rights

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

An additional $425,000 is provided for this Commission of which $399,000 is for the initiation of a study of the problems of race and education as requested by the President in November, 1965, and $26,000 is for increased pay and related costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The sum of $3,000,000 is contained in the bill to finance additional training and technical assistance activities for alleviation of problems caused by desegregation of schools as authorized in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The additional sum of $500,000 is provided in the accompanying bill for this Commission. The amount of $52,000 is to finance increased pay and related costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301 and $448,000 is to develop a program of affirmative action designed to achieve voluntary compliance with the objective of equal employment opportunities and for the processing of more complaints of discrimination in employment than was originally anticipated by the Commission.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
383	Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	$500,000	$450,000	−$50,000
383	Payment to Foreign Service retirement and disability fund	45,000	45,000	
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS			
383	American sections, international commissions	32,000	0	−32,000
	Total, Department of State	577,000	495,000	−82,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
383	Fees and expenses of witnesses	(1)	(1)	
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM			
383	Support of United States prisoners	500,000	475,000	−25,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	PATENT OFFICE			
383	Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	1,000,000	

	THE JUDICIARY			
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES			
383	Salaries of judges	220,000	200,000	−20,000
383	Fees of jurors and commissioners	1,165,000	1,165,000	
	Total, the judiciary	1,385,000	1,365,000	−20,000
	RELATED AGENCIES			
	COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS			
383	Salaries and expenses	468,000	425,000	−43,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
383	Civil rights educational activities	3,250,000	3,000,000	−250,000
	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION			
383	Salaries and expenses	742,000	500,000	−242,000
	Total, related agencies	4,460,000	3,925,000	−535,000
	Total, chapter VII	7,922,000	7,260,000	−662,000

[1] Language increasing limitation by $25,000.

CHAPTER VIII

SUBCOMMITTEE

TOM STEED, Oklahoma, *Chairman*

OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, New York
JEFFERY COHELAN, California
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
SILVIO O. CONTE, Massachusetts
HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Operations

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $269,904,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 below the budget estimate. The funds recommended are to provide for the handling of a substantial increase in mail volume, and to comply with the requirements of various laws enacted subsequent to the passage of the regular annual appropriation bill last year.

The Department requested $2,000,000 to provide for sixth day delivery of parcel post. The Committee is of the opinion that the urgency of this program is not of the highest order and can be deferred at this time. It is considering this matter in connection with the 1967 estimates.

Transportation

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $21,000,000, the amount of the budget request, to provide for transportation services incident to the greatly increased mail volume referred to above.

Plant and Equipment

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,106,000, the amount of the budget request, to accelerate the procurement and installation of mechanical equipment in post offices as part of a stepped-up program to improve efficiency and service.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT			
383	Operations	$271,904,000	$269,904,000	—$2,000,000
383	Transportation	21,000,000	21,000,000	
383	Plant and equipment	3,106,000	3,106,000	
	Total, Post Office Department	296,010,000	294,010,000	—2,000,000
	Total, chapter VIII	296,010,000	294,010,000	—2,000,000

CHAPTER IX

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

The Committee recommends the appropriation of $10,251,798, the amount of the estimate, for claims and judgments rendered against the United States. Of this amount, $3,876,205 represents damage and other type claims, the payments of which are due under various laws, and $6,375,593 represents judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims and U.S. district courts. Details concerning these claims and judgments are contained in House Document numbered 414, Eighty-ninth Congress.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

This title of the bill deals exclusively with additional funds to help meet increased pay costs—military and civilian—authorized by or pursuant to law in all three branches of the government and the District of Columbia. Additionally, various appropriations in title I of this bill have blended into them amounts for similar increased pay costs—a procedure followed to avoid confusion that would probably arise if the supplemental under a given item were arbitrarily split and shown in two places. The specific requests are in House Documents 380, 383, and 405; there is also an unbudgeted $19,000 legislative branch item.

The following abbreviated resume shows budget requests for these pay costs during the current fiscal year 1966; the estimated absorptions; and the additional amounts budgeted and allowed.

	In millions of dollars, rounded		
	Total estimated costs, fiscal year 1966	Absorptions proposed	Budget requests for added funds
Pay of members of military services (Act of Aug. 21, 1965, P.L. 89–132, an average pay raise of 10.4 percent)	$870. 1	$96. 0 (11%)	$774. 1
Civilian pay (Act of Oct. 29, 1965, P.L. 89–301, an average pay raise of 3.6 percent; also, comparable raises granted administratively; and wage-board increases)	600. 2	194. 1 (32%)	[1] 406. 1
Totals	1, 470. 3	[2] 290. 1 (20%)	1, 180. 2

[1] Includes $838,850 for Senate operations not considered by committee. [2] Includes some that hinge on Congressional action on transfers, lifting limitations, and the like.

$963,120,770 is included in title II, a reduction of $7,433,600 from the budget requests for additional appropriations accounted for under that title. Additionally, various items in title I include approximately $208,314,500, a reduction of $454,000 from the requests of $208,768,500 for increased pay costs submitted and considered in connection with supplements for other than increased pay costs. Thus, for all increased pay and wage purposes, the bill includes a total of $1,171,435,270, which is $8,726,450 less than the aggregate budget requests of $1,180,161,720; the difference represents requests of $838,850 for Senate items not considered by the committee, and further savings of $7,887,600 made by the committee.

Each subcommittee concerned with the applicable programs and activities reviewed the related pay supplementals. Some reductions were made in four groups, including the legislative branch where, unlike those for the executive branch, the requests had not been centrally screened.

But large reductions were impractical. The added costs have been running since last fall and it would be unduly disruptive to the many on-going functions if large additional absorptions were imposed this late in the fiscal year. Already, as the tabulation shows, 11 percent of the military pay raise and 32 percent of the civilian raises are being absorbed; the overall absorption, Government-wide, being about 20 percent.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 4, line 15, in connection with Rent Supplement Program:

: Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

On page 10, in connection with National Teacher Corps:

Provided, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: Provided further, That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

MINORITY VIEWS

Only this week, the House voted final approval of the Supplemental Defense Appropriation Bill, H.R. 13546, for the remaining portion of fiscal year 1966, which ends next June 30. That bill provided $13.1 billion of new obligational authority to be used principally in behalf of the war in Vietnam.

We, the undersigned, supported passage of H.R. 13546 just as we have consistently supported the President's prior requests for funds with which to prosecute the war in Vietnam. We stand ready to do whatever is necessary in the future to back up our Nation's commitment of men and material in Vietnam.

No one knows when the war in Vietnam will be terminated nor does anyone know with certainty what its eventual cost will be. It is apparent, however, that our defense needs and expenditures were originally understated in last year's budget request and they are still underestimated in the fiscal 1967 budget.

We pointed out to the House last August 19 (House Report 818 on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Supplemental Appropriation Bill, H.R. 10586) that the initial budget for fiscal 1966 had deliberately underfunded defense needs by several billion dollars in order to pave the way for Great Society spending proposals and to keep the facade of a one hundred billion dollar budget.

Our judgment in that regard has been more than sustained by the supplemental request for defense needs of $700 million late in fiscal 1965 and a budget amendment of $1.7 billion in fiscal 1966 which were granted last year and by the supplemental of $13.1 billion on which the House voted final approval this week.

With respect to fiscal 1967, it can be predicted with virtual certainty that additional supplemental requests for defense will be needed and will be forthcoming in the late Fall of 1966 or the early Winter of 1967 to make up for the deficiencies in the 1967 defense budget.

In the light of our confirmed judgment of last August and the virtual certainty that defense needs are understated in the 1967 budget, it is time for the Administration, and if it is not willing then the Congress, to establish a system of priorities on the Administration's unbridled plans for domestic nondefense spending in fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

This Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill would provide appropriations of $2,564,872,568. The spending authority requested by the President for new programs included in this bill totals more than one-half billion dollars. Although the Committee reduced these requests by nearly one-quarter billion dollars, substantial funds remain in this bill to start new programs.

The situation in Southeast Asia is far different today than it was when Congress enacted these new programs last year. The war in Vietnam is being escalated and the demands for men and material with which to fight the war are increasing daily. Congress now has the opportunity of taking a second look at these programs and rendering a judgment with respect to the validity of providing funds

for them at this time when compared with our increasing needs in Vietnam.

The inescapable fact that we are at war cannot be successfully denied by the Administration or, for that matter, by the Congress. Therefore, we can no longer continue "business as usual" without running the risk of incurring runaway inflation and the imposition of additional taxes to curb inflation and to finance the unessential or low priority domestic spending programs of the Administration.

Despite protestations to the contrary by spokesmen for the Administration, the fear of inflation and the probable imposition of additional taxes are subjects of constant and continuing consideration by the Executive Branch.

Americans have always risen to the demands placed upon them by war. We are certain that they are willing now to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to win the war in Vietnam and to restore peace to a troubled world. But we are also convinced that they are not willing for this Administration, or the Congress, to have "its cake and eat it too" through wasteful and unessential domestic spending in time of war.

Last August 19 we made these conclusions crystal clear to the Congress when we said:

"In light of these inescapable facts, a hard look should already have been taken at nondefense related projects with an eye toward cutting substantially the dollar amounts appropriated, where possible, and putting off the implementation of marginal or not-absolutely-necessary domestic welfare programs.

"War calls for sacrifices.

"This war is no exception.

"To postpone the sacrifices can only invite a terrible strain on an already burdened economy. The rising costs of living and the shrinking purchasing power of the dollar in large part are the result of business as usual in recent years even without the added strains and stresses of the large-scale needs of the present war situation.

"Those large-scale needs are now upon us. To attempt to finance them by additional deficit financing without first bending every effort to tighten the Nation's belt in the nondefense spending area is to court an economic situation that will further erode the value of the dollar, more deeply threaten the economic well-being of low and middle income citizens and the economic health of our Nation.

"It is incumbent upon Members of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress to discharge their urgent responsibility of reexamining thoroughly those programs that have yet to be funded in this fiscal year.

"Wherever possible, dollar amounts for nondefense programs should be cut back or eliminated. A hard decision must be made on programs which may in the short run be desirable but that in the long run can only contribute to the further deterioration of what is essential in time of war—a sound dollar and a sound economy. . . .

"The Congress of the United States is charged with the primary responsibility of determining how large a federal budget our economy can stand. It is within the power of the Congress even yet in this session of the 89th Congress to make substantial reeavaluation of the level of expenditures it would be prudent to impose on the economy at this time."

Demands on the Administration and the Congress to be selective in the financing of Government programs are even more compelling now than they were last August.

We recognize that over the years the Executive Branch has utilized supplemental appropriation bills for the initial funding of new programs. This is an undesirable practice, in our opinion, and should be discontinued. We believe that new programs should be funded, generally, in the regular appropriation bills for affected Departments and agencies. To the extent that funds for new programs were provided in the regular bills, Members of the Committee (and Congress, as a whole) would be better able to evaluate the relative importance of new program needs to total funds requested for a Department or agency.

We, the undersigned, therefore, firmly believe that funds for the new programs that are provided for in the bill should be further studied. There is no urgent need for their immediate funding. The Appropriations Committee should further study these requests in relation to overall budget needs. The Committee should notify the Administration that funds for new and expanded domestic spending programs will be withheld until such time as a more realistic assessment of overall national security needs for fiscal year 1967 (including those for Southeast Asia) is submitted to the Congress. Moreover, to the extent that the Administration refuses to reassess our defense needs and to the extent that it refuses to assign priorities to these and other domestic nondefense spending requests, then the Committee should undertake that responsibility. To that end, we recommend that the House recommit this bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that funds proposed therein for new programs and expansions of existing programs be further studied for the purpose of making additional cuts in the appropriations requested.

FRANK T. BOW.
CHARLES R. JONAS.
MELVIN R. LAIRD.
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG.
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB.
JOHN J. RHODES.
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL.
ROBERT H. MICHEL.
ODIN LANGEN.
BEN REIFEL.
GLENN R. DAVIS.
HOWARD W. ROBISON.
GARNER E. SHRIVER.
MARK ANDREWS.

○

Union Calendar No. 580

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14012

[Report No. 1349]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 25, 1966

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second

Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Federal Payment to District of Columbia

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" for the general fund, $1,250,000.

Operating Expenses

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including $3,700 for disbursement by the administrative office of the United States courts for expenses of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, $1,249,200, of which $111,600 shall be payable from the highway fund, $200 from the water fund, and $200 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", $210,600.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be

paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year involved.

CHAPTER II

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Selective Service System

salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $10,180,000.

Veterans Administration

compensation and pensions

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", $288,000,000, to remain available until expended.

readjustment benefits

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", including not to exceed $75,000 for the purposes of section 5 of

the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–41), $45,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

rent supplement program

For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $100,000: *Provided,* That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451 (c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $1,495,000.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", $755,000.

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", $1,028,000.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", $827,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $900,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)", $5,500,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $148,000.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $658,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For additional amounts for "Forest protection and utilization", as follows:

"Forest land management", $9,635,000;

"Forest research", $610,000; and

"State and private forestry cooperation", $45,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $18,000.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For an additional amount for "Transitional grants to Alaska", $876,000.

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses of worker adjustment assistance allowances and for administration of adjustment assistance services to workers as provided in Title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794), and Title III of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–283), $1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses," $1,028,000, of which

$821,900 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" and $206,100 may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

Wage and Labor Standards

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", $614,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Expansion and improvement of vocational education", for advances for reserve funds and interest payments on insured loans under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, $950,000.

VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

For the vocational student loan insurance fund created by section 13 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (70 Stat. 1046), $50,000, to remain available until expended.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Elementary and secondary educational activities", for meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children under title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, $184,000,000.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher Educational Activities", $11,300,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for basic grants authorized in section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $1,000,000 shall be for training grants under section 223 of that Act, and $300,000 shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials under part C of title II of that Act.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

For the National Teacher Corps authorized in part B

of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $10,000,000: *Provided,* That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: *Provided further,* That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts", $41,000,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES

For an additional amount for "Grants to States", for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, $39,000,000.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount for "National Library of Medicine", including carrying out the Medical Library Assistance

Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1059), $4,175,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1967.

Social Security Administration

PAYMENT TO TRUST FUNDS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance trust funds, as authorized by sections 103 and 111 (d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and section 1844 of the Social Security Act, $125,800,000, of which $100,000,000 shall remain available through December 31, 1967, as authorized by section 1844.

PAYMENT FOR MILITARY SERVICE CREDITS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the Federal Disability Insurance, and the Federal Hospital Insurance trust funds, for benefit payments and other costs resulting from noncontributory coverage extended certain veterans as provided under section 217 (g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, $105,000,000.

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance", $381,000,000.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

GALLAUDET COLLEGE, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", $24,000.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Howard University, salaries and expenses", $216,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration", $13,000, together with not to exceed $53,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", $1,075,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

CHAPTER V

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Eva Hassell Bonner, widow of Herbert C. Bonner, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, $30,000.

For payment to Lera Millard Thomas, widow of Albert Thomas, late a Representative from the State of Texas, $30,000.

For payment to Mary I. Baldwin, widow of John F. Baldwin, late a Representative from the State of California, $30,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For an additional amount for "Capitol grounds", $17,000.

CHAPTER VI

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies", $7,750,000, to remain available until expended.

THE PANAMA CANAL

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", $300,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Southwestern Power Administration

construction

For an additional amount for "Construction", $520,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service

For an additional amount for "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service", $450,000.

payment to foreign service retirement and disability fund

For payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, $45,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

fees and expenses of witnesses

In addition to the amount heretofore made available in the appropriation under this head for the current fiscal year for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), not to exceed $25,000 shall be available in such appropriation for such compensation and expenses.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", $475,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PATENT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $1,000,000.

THE JUDICIARY

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", $200,000.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and commissioners", $1,165,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $425,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Civil rights educational activities," including not to exceed $225,000 for salaries and expenses, $3,000,000.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $500,000.

CHAPTER VIII

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Operations", $269,904,000.

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for "Transportation", $21,000,000.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", $3,106,000.

CHAPTER IX

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,251,798, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in said judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further,* That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

Legislative Branch

Joint Items:

"Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures", $945, to remain available until expended;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Joint Economic Committee", $9,000;

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", $8,250;

"Joint Committee on Printing", $3,750;

Contingent expenses of the House:

"Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation", $10,530;

"Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy", $655;

"Joint Committee on Defense Production", $2,160;

House:

"Compensation of Members", $7,500;

"Office of the Speaker", $3,155;

"Office of the Parliamentarian", $2,755;

"Compilation of Precedents", $270;

"Office of the Chaplain", $410;

"Office of the Clerk", $41,230;

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms", $28,205;

"Office of the Doorkeeper", $43,745;

"Office of the Postmaster", $13,825;

"Committee employees", $103,000;

"Six minority employees", $3,175;

"Majority floor leader", $2,340;

"Minority floor leader", $1,940;

"Majority whip", $1,565;

"Minority whip", $1,565;

"Printing clerks", $430;

"Technical assistant to attending physician", $385;

"Official reporters of debates", $6,880;

"Official reporters to committees", $6,940;

"Legislative counsel", $7,970;

"Members' clerk hire", $770,000;

"Special and select committees", $100,000:

"Coordinator of information", $3,675;

"Revision of the laws", $730;

"Speaker's auto", $330;

"Majority leader's auto", $330;

"Minority leader's auto", $330;

"Miscellaneous items", $19,000, for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812);

Architect of the Capitol:

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", $13,900;

Capitol buildings and grounds:

"Capitol buildings", $40,000;

"Capitol grounds", $10,000;

"Capitol power plant", $10,000;

"Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care", $13,000;

Botanic Garden: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000;

Library of Congress:

"Salaries and expenses", $256,700;

Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", $51,500;

Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", $62,200;

Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses", $65,300;

Books for the Blind: "Salaries and expenses", $6,600;

"Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)", $3,600;

Government Printing Office:

Office of Superintendent of Documents:

"Salaries and expenses": Not to exceed $65,000 of the reserve fund under this head for the current fiscal year may be used for increased pay costs authorized by law.

THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States:

"Salaries", $41,000;

"Care of Buildings and Grounds", $5,000;

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Customs Court: "Salaries and expenses", $19,000;

Court of Claims: "Salaries and expenses", $13,300;

Court of appeals; district courts, and other judicial services:

"Salaries of supporting personnel", $818,000;

"Administrative Office of the United States Courts", $31,000;

"Expenses of referees", $125,000, to be derived from the "Referees' salary and expense fund".

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The White House Office:

"Salaries and expenses", $85,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Special projects", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of the Budget: "Salaries and expenses", $131,000;

Council of Economic Advisers: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000;

National Security Council: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000;

Office of Emergency Planning: "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies", $86,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", fiscal year 1966;

Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic assistance:

"Administrative expenses", Agency for International Development, $980,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966;

"Administrative and other expenses", Department of State, $42,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service:

"Salaries and expenses", as follows:

"Research", $2,402,500; and

"Plant and animal disease and pest control", $1,268,500;

Cooperative State Research Service: "Payments and expenses", $32,000;

Extension Service: "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses": Of the amount made available under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, for "Payment to States

and Puerto Rico", $64,000 shall be transferred to the sub-appropriation for "Federal Extension Service";

Farmer Cooperative Service: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

Soil Conservation Service:

"Conservation operations", $2,608,000;

"Watershed planning", $140,000, to remain available until expended;

"Watershed protection", $585,000, to remain available until expended;

"Flood prevention", $160,000, to remain available until expended;

"Great Plains conservation program", $82,000, to remain available until expended;

"Resource conservation and development", $46,000, to remain available until expended;

Economic Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", $246,000;

Statistical Reporting Service: "Salaries and expenses", $250,000;

Consumer and Marketing Service: "Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", $1,905,000;

Foreign Agricultural Service: "Salaries and expenses", $178,000;

Commodity Exchange Authority: "Salaries and expenses", $28,000;

Rural Electrification Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $268,000;

Farmers Home Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: "Administrative and operating expenses", $202,000;

Rural Community Development Service: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

Office of the Inspector General: "Salaries and expenses", $145,000;

Office of the General Counsel: "Salaries and expenses", $102,000;

Office of Information: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

National Agricultural Library: "Salaries and expenses", $36,000;

Office of Management Services: "Salaries and expenses", $59,000;

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000;

Forest Service: "Forest roads and trails (liquidation of

contract authorization)", $964,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $89,000;

Office of Business Economics: "Salaries and expenses", $50,000;

Bureau of the Census:

"Salaries and expenses", $320,000;

"1964 Census of Agriculture", $110,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967;

Business and Defense Services Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $125,000;

International Activities:

"Salaries and expenses", $160,000, of which $23,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1967;

"Export control", $100,000, of which $33,400 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs;

Office of Field Services: "Salaries and expenses", $90,000;

Coast and Geodetic Survey: "Salaries and expenses", $510,000;

National Bureau of Standards: "Research and technical services", $500,000;

Weather Bureau:

"Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;

"Research and development", $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968;

"Meteorological satellite operations", $48,000, to remain available until expended;

Maritime Administration:

"Salaries and expenses", $222,000, of which $200,000 is for administrative expenses and $22,000 is for reserve fleet expenses;

"Maritime training", $38,000;

Bureau of Public Roads: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $950,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administration and research).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Military personnel:

"Military personnel, Army", $222,100,000;

"Military personnel, Navy", $182,600,000;

"Military personnel, Marine Corps", $42,400,000;

"Military personnel, Air Force", $227,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Navy", $4,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", $1,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Air Force", $1,200,000;

"National Guard personnel, Army", $4,500,000;

"National Guard personnel, Air Force", $3,500,000;

"Retired pay, Defense", $71,000,000;

Operation and maintenance:

"Operation and maintenance, Army", $33,400,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Navy", $23,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", $1,054,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air Force", $27,600,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", $14,356,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", $2,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard", $1,000,000;

"Court of Military Appeals, Defense", $11,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army:

Cemeterial expenses: "Salaries and expenses", $67,000;

Corps of Engineers—Civil: "General expenses", $385,000;

Ryukyu Islands, Army: "Administration", $40,000;

The Panama Canal:

Panama Canal Company: "Limitation on general and administrative expenses" (increase of $137,000 in the limitation on the amount available for general and administrative expenses);

United States Soldiers' Home: "Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay" (increase of $146,000 in the amount available for maintenance and operation to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service:

"Hospitals and medical care", $770,000;

"Foreign quarantine activities", $212,000;

"Indian health activities", $1,355,000;

Saint Elizabeths Hospital: "Salaries and expenses", the total amount available for "Salaries and expenses" in the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966", is hereby increased from $29,886,000 to $30,613,000;

Social Security Administration: "Limitation on salaries

and expenses, Social Security Administration" (increase of $8,037,000 in the amount to be expended, as authorized by section 201 (g) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein);

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $18,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund;

"Surplus property utilization", $20,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Federal Housing Administration: "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration" (increases of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses);

Public Housing Administration:

"Administrative expenses", $405,000;

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Public Housing Administration" (increase of $405,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses).

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs:

"Education and welfare services", $1,202,400;

"General administrative expenses", $103,000;

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Office of Territories: "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands", $102,600;

Mineral Resources:

Geological Survey: "Surveys, investigations, and research", $1,510,000;

Bureau of Mines:

"Conservation and development of mineral resources", $500,000;

"Health and safety", $92,000;

"General administrative expenses", $22,000;

Office of Oil and Gas: "Salaries and expenses", $16,300;

Fish and Wildlife Service:

Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: "Salaries and expenses", $8,500;

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

"Management and investigation of resources", $86,800, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development", fiscal year 1966;

"General administrative expenses", $15,000;

"Administration of Pribilof Islands", $10,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: "General administrative expenses", $34,300;

National Park Service: "General administrative expenses", $57,000;

Bureau of Reclamation: "General administrative expenses", $241,200, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operation and maintenance", fiscal year 1966;

Bonneville Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $173,000;

Southwestern Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $25,300;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $109,800;

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $105,000;

Office of Water Resources Research: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration:

Alien property activities: "Limitation on general

administrative expenses" (increase of $7,000 in the amount for general administrative expenses);

"Salaries and expenses, antitrust division", $45,000;

"Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", $647,000;

Federal Bureau of Investigation: "Salaries and expenses", $3,735,000;

Immigration and Naturalization Service: "Salaries and expenses", $1,782,000;

Federal Prison System: "Salaries and expenses", $1,035,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration:

Office of Manpower Administrator: "Salaries and expenses", $66,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Manpower development and training activities", $25,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training: "Salaries and expenses", $87,000, to be derived by transfer from

the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Wage and Labor Standards:

Bureau of Labor Standards: "Salaries and expenses", $39,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Women's Bureau: "Salaries and expenses", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Employees' Compensation: "Salaries and expenses", $58,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $1,550 to be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 944);

Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Salaries and expenses", $242,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of International Labor Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," fiscal year 1966;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $3,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, unemployment trust fund;

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $35,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Federal contract compliance program", $7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

"Administration and regional operation", $1,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,760,000, of which $1,299,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966, and $123,600 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Extension and remodeling, State Department Building";

International organizations and conferences: "Missions to international organizations", $59,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966;

International commissions:

International Boundary and Water Commission. United States and Mexico: "Salaries and expenses", $17,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $138,000;

Bureau of Customs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,043,000;

Bureau of Narcotics: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

Bureau of the Public Debt: "Administering the public debt", $360,000;

Coast Guard:

"Operating expenses", $9,400,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966;

"Retired pay", $1,000,000;

"Reserve training", $1,050,000;

Internal Revenue Service:

"Salaries and expenses", $381,000;

"Revenue accounting and processing", $3,472,000;

"Compliance", $9,305,000;

Office of the Treasurer: "Salaries and expenses", $60,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

United States Secret Service: "Salaries and expenses, guard force", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, United States Secret Service", fiscal year 1966.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

"Operations", $9,500,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport", $54,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport", $62,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", $4,600,000;

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service", $861,000, of which $55,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966;

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", $336,000;

"Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service", $135,000, of which $45,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966, and $90,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966;

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", $33,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"General operating expenses", $1,000,000;

"Medical and prosthetic research", $365,000;

"Medical care", $17,456,000.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Civil Aeronautics Board: "Salaries and expenses", $240,000;

Civil Service Commission:

"Salaries and expenses", $528,000, and in addition $15,000 may be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations";

"Limitation on administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund" (increase of $6,200 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Farm Credit Administration: "Limitation on administrative expenses" (increase of $28,000 in the limi-

tation on the amount available for administrative expenses) ;

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: "Salaries and expenses", $1,500;

Federal Communications Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $346,000;

Federal Home Loan Bank Board:

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (increase of $75,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses) ;

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation" (increase of $6,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses) ;

Federal Maritime Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: "Salaries and expenses", $115,000;

Federal Power Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $300,000;

Federal Trade Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $312,500;

General Accounting Office: "Salaries and expenses", $535,000;

Intergovernmental commissions:

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Interstate Commerce Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $625,000;

National Labor Relations Board: "Salaries and expenses", $548,100;

National Mediation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $27,000;

Renegotiation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $30,000;

Small Business Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $150,000;

Smithsonian Institution:

"Salaries and expenses", $453,000;

"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", $66,000;

Tariff Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $46,000;

Tax Court of the United States: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

United States Information Agency: "Salaries and expenses", $1,005,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

Operating expenses:

"General operating expenses", $325,800, of which $4,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $1,400 from the motor vehicle parking account), $800 from the water fund, and $100 from the sanitary sewage works fund;

"Health and welfare", $920,500;

"Highways and traffic", $95,900, of which $78,000 shall be payable from the highway fund;

"Sanitary engineering", $253,000, of which $59,300 shall be payable from the water fund and $20,700 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1966.

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 202. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations

or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1966, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Union Calendar No. 580

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14012

[Report No. 1349]

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MAHON

MARCH 25, 1966

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

H. R. 14012

A BILL

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued March 30, 1966
For actions of March 29, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 54

CONTENTS

Animal research.....9,30
Appropriations..6,12,35,48
Banking.....39
CCC corn.....17
Child nutrition.....45
Civil rights.....27
Claims.....33
Committee.....46
Comptroller General.....34
Conservation.....20,25
Corn prices.....17
Daylight time.....14
Disaster relief.....12
Education.....37
Electrification.....22,41
Ethics.....46
Export controls.....7
Federal procurement.....55
Food.....19,42
Foreign affairs.....32
Foreign aid.....10,15,49
Foreign currencies.....26
Forest Service.....6,48
Forestry.....16,23,38
Grants.....27
Hides and skins.....7
Inflation.....8,17
Labor standards.....1
Latin America.....54
Legislative program.....11
Loans.....4,22,41,50
Manpower.....44
Milk.....18,43
Minimum wage.....1
Monopolies.....40
Parking.....36
Pay costs.....6
Personnel.....34,46
Postal rates.....51
Poverty.....29
Public debt.....47
REA loans.....22,41
Reclamation.....2
Research...3,9,11,24,30,52
Roads.....16,38
Safety standards.....13
School milk.....18,43
Small business.....4,50
Soil surveys.....21
Soil and water conservation.....20
Supplemental appropriations...6,12,48
Surplus products.....10
Telephones.....41
Timber.....23
Tobacco.....31
Vehicles.....36
Water research.....3,11,24
Watersheds.....5,35
Wildlife.....53

HIGHLIGHTS: see page 7

* HOUSE

1. LABOR STANDARDS. The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment H. R. 13712, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees and to raise the minimum wage (H. Rept. 1366) (p. 6777). The bill extends the minimum-wage and overtime provisions to agricultural, logging, and Federal employees, among others. The minimum wage for agricultural employees would begin at $1 per hour effective Feb. 1, 1967, and gradually increase to $1.30 effective Feb. 1, 1969. Rep. Dent inserted a summary of the bill (pp. 6770-2).

2. RECLAMATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 707, to authorize Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oreg., and H. R. 2829, to authorize Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson Unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash. p. 6777

3. WATER RESEARCH. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3606, to promote a more adequate national program of water research. p. 6777

4. SMALL BUSINESS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 2729, to increase the ceiling on the Small Business Administration revolving fund. p. 6777

5. WATERSHED. The Agriculture Committee approved the work plan for the Monroe-Annabella, Utah, watershed project. p. 6707

6. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966. By a vote of 269 to 122, passed as reported this bill, H. R. 14012 (pp. 6708-69). The bill includes funds for this Department as follows: (1) Appropriations for pay costs pursuant to Public Law 89-301 and wage board increases, $15,841,000 and a transfer of $64,000, and (2) supplemental appropriations for the Forest Service for fighting forest fires, $7,500,000. For details of the amounts requested see Digests 29, 30, and 41.

7. EXPORT CONTROLS. Rep. Curtis stated that the Export Control Act, "under which controls had on March 7 been imposed on exports of U. S. hides and other leathers, does not contain proper consultative procedures", and inserted two letters on the subject. pp. 6774-5

8. INFLATION. Rep. Curtis inserted an article, "...Administration Effort to Curb Wages and Prices Seen Facing Difficulties." pp. 6775-6

9. ANIMAL RESEARCH. Rep. Bolton urged support of her bill, H. R. 13346, to authorize this Department to regulate the handling of experimental animals, listed the "weaknesses" of a similar bill reported by the Agriculture Committee, and inserted an article, "Weak Pet Bill." p. 6776

10. FOREIGN AID. Reps. Albert and Boggs commended the President's proposal to establish an Indian-American Foundation "to be financed by $300 million worth of Indian currencies held by the United States through the sale of surplus agricultural products." pp. 6769, 6769-70

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that on Wed. the House will consider the water research bill. p. D262

*SENATE

12. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President (S. Doc. 35) a supplemental appropriation estimate of $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1966 for the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund, Farmers Home Administration, to provide disaster relief loans for losses due to Hurricane Betsy in La. and Fla., and blizzards in the Dakotas and Minn; to Appropriations Committee. p. 6534

13. SAFETY STANDARDS. By a vote of 79 to 0, passed with amendments S. 2669, to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce. pp. 6574-83, 6585

14. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME. Both Houses received, and the Senate agreed to, the conference report on S. 1404, the proposed Uniform Time Act of 1966, to establish uniform dates (from the last Sunday of Apr. to the last Sunday of Oct. each year) for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in all States and jurisdictions where it is observed (H. Rept. 1385). pp. 6664-5, 6774

15. FOREIGN AID. Sens. Mansfield, Dirksen, and others commended the President's proposal for the establishment of an Indian-American Foundation in education to encourage new and experimental projects in science, technology, and agriculture to aid in the economic development of India. pp. 6533-4, 6609, 6627-8, 6628-30, 6652

16. ROADS. Received from Treasury and Commerce a proposed bill "to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways," including authorizations for forest roads and trails of $85 million for fiscal year 1968 and $110 million for the fiscal year 1969; to Finance and Public Works Committees. p. 6534

Sen. Jordan, Idaho, submitted an amendment to S. 3155, the proposed Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966, to increase the authorizations for forest roads and trails from $85 to $170 million for fiscal year 1968 and from $110 to $170 million for fiscal year 1969. pp. 6554-5

17. INFLATION; CORN PRICES. Sen. Proxmire defended the President's fight against inflation, and stated that the sale of CCC corn "takes the pressure off pork and beef prices," and that the President "has given Under Secretary of Agriculture Schnittker responsibility to keep food prices down." pp. 6557-9

Sen. Pearson expressed concern over possible inflation and criticized the "mass dumping of corn on the open market by the Commodity Credit Corporation." pp. 6661-4

18. SCHOOL MILK. Sens. Proxmire and Tydings criticized the budget cuts for the school milk program. pp. 6559, 6627

19. FOOD FOR FREEDOM. Sen. Long, Mo., inserted Secretary Freeman's speech to the Mid-continent Farmers Assoc. in support of the proposed Food for Freedom program. pp. 6602-4

Sen. Tydings inserted a summary prepared by the staff of the Agriculture

and Forestry Committee of testimony presented by witnesses on the proposed Food for Freedom program. pp. 6634-9

20. SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION. Sen. Tydings inserted Under Secretary Schnittker's speech to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin concerning soil and water conservation problems in urban areas. pp. 6618-20

21. SOIL SURVEYS. Sen. Williams, N. J., inserted an article by Secretary Freeman on soil survey activities of this Department. pp. 6631-2

22. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Metcalf defended the two-percent loans by REA to cooperatives, and inserted a speech reveiwing a proposed supplemental financing program for REA coops adopted at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Assoc. pp. 6632-4

23. FORESTRY. Sen. Morse defended the policy of the Forest Service on allowable timber cut and inserted several items on the matter. pp. 6652-61

24. WATER RESOURCES. Received from the President a report, "A 10-Year Program of Federal Water Resources Research"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 6534

Cosponsors were added to S. 3107, to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs (p. 6555). Sen. Tower spoke in support of this bill (p. 6617).

25. CONSERVATION. Sen. Metcalf inserted a speech by the president of the Wildlife Management Institute urging greater efforts to conserve our natural resources. pp. 6645-7

26. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Sen. Hayden inserted a report on expenditure of foreign currencies by the Commerce Committee. p. 6535

27. CIVIL RIGHTS; GRANTS. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted an article discussing guidelines issued by the Justice Department to other Federal agencies handling grants "on how they were to proceed under the Civil Rights Act." p. 6593

29. POVERTY. Sens. Tower and Byrd, W. V., inserted items critical of administration of the poverty program. pp. 6630-1, 6642-3

Sen. Bayh commended and inserted a report on the Neighborhood Youth Corps sponsored by the Indiana Farmers Union. pp. 6644-5

30. RESEARCH. Sen. Neuberger inserted an article commending the care of animals used in research by the Oregon Medical School. pp. 6665-6

31. TOBACCO. Sen. Neuberger inserted portions of an address by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission critical of cigarette advertising practices of the broadcast industry. p. 6666

32. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Sen. Clark reviewed the results of the White House Conference on International Cooperation and inserted several items on the subject. pp. 6667-6706

*(The proceedings of both Houses for Mar. 29 were not printed in full and will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)

89TH CONGRESS
2d Session
SENATE
DOCUMENT
No. 85

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR VARIOUS AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1966

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND PROVISIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1966, IN THE AMOUNT OF $180,843,000 FOR VARIOUS AGENCIES

MARCH 29 (legislative day, MARCH 25), 1966.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 29, 1966.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $180,843,000 for various agencies.

The details of these proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for their submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

50-012

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $180,843,000 for various agencies as follows:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For subscriptions to the Asian Development Bank, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, to remain available until expended, $140,000,000, of which $20,000,000 shall be available for the first installment on paid-in capital stock, $20,000,000 shall be available for the second installment on such stock, and $100,000,000 shall be available for the entire subscription to callable capital stock.

This proposed appropriation for the Asian Development Bank will provide the entire U.S. subscription to the Bank's callable capital stock and the first and second installments of the U.S. subscription to the Bank's paid-in capital stock.

Legislation providing for U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank, enacted March 16, 1966, Public Law 89–360, authorizes a U.S. subscription of $200,000,000 of the Bank's $1,000,000,000 capital stock. Of this amount, $100,000,000 is callable and is to be subscribed without cash payment, and $100,000,000 is required to be paid-in. The paid-in portion is divided into five equal installments, the first of which is due at the time the U.S. deposits a ratification of the Bank's charter or within 30 days after the charter enters into force, whichever is later. Succeeding installments are due at intervals of approximately 1 year after the first is paid. The callable portion must be subscribed in full at the time the first paid-in capital installment is deposited. The final date for deposit of ratification documents is September 30, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for the "Emergency credit revolving fund", $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed appropriation would provide additional capital to the emergency credit revolving fund to meet the increased demand from farmers for credit assistance as a result of damages incurred in natural disasters. Such increased loan assistance is primarily needed in area stricken by Hurricane Betsy, recent heavy snowstorms in the Midwest, and continuing drought conditions in the Northeast.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

1967 Alaska Centennial

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Alaska Centennial Act of 1966, including administrative expenses, to remain available until June 30, 1968, $4,600,000, of which not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for grants to the State of Alaska, and not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the Centennial celebration.

This proposed appropriation will provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the Alaska Purchase, as authorized by recently enacted legislation. This law authorizes the appropriation of $600,000 for Federal participation in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the centennial celebration, and $4,000,000 for matching grants to the State of Alaska for projects which support the objectives of the centennial as a national event, and will be a permanent contribution to the economy of Alaska.

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center

For expenses necessary to conduct the studies and submit the reports, and for related expenses, required by section 2(b) of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89–355), as to the proposed participation by the United States, by foreign countries, and industry in Interama, $160,000, to remain available until expended.

This request will cover the expenses of conducting a study and compiling a report on the nature, extent, and cost of U.S. participation in the proposed Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and the nature and extent of participation of foreign countries (particularly Latin American countries) and private industries.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $542,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation will provide for the reconstruction of roads and other facilities of the National Park Service damaged by high winds and floods in Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The damage which occurred in mid-February should be repaired as soon as possible to permit full use of the facilities in this area of high public use.

The amount requested is in addition to the proposed supplemental appropriation included in House Document No. 383.

Office of Territories

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Administration of territories", $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Funds are requested for a grant to American Samoa to establish a housing loan program for construction of houses for Samoans whose

homes were destroyed by a hurricane on January 31, 1966. Housing replacements will be financed from this loan fund together with a grant by the Office of Emergency Planning.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

General Operating Expenses

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", $3,000,000.

The Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–358, approved March 3, 1966), authorizes educational assistance, home loans, loan guarantees, and other benefits for veterans who have served in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955. The proposed supplemental appropriation is to cover the administrative costs of handling inquiries and applications for this assistance and other benefits for eligible veterans. This request is in addition to the proposed supplemental appropriation included in House Document No. 405.

This appropriation was twice apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. These actions were reported to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget on January 28 and March 22, 1966.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Operation and Maintenance of Properties

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance of properties", $12,000.

Additional funds are needed to cover the costs incurred in the replacement of a boiler which broke down at the St. Mary's Apartments which are part of the title I public housing properties. The immediate replacement of the boiler was necessary to protect the life, health, and safety of the families living in these units.

This appropriation was apportioned, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on March 16, 1966.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $29,000.

Additional funds are requested to finance the increased workload and personnel costs required by the recent enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation on Administrative and Nonadministrative Expenses

Funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for nonadministrative expenses shall hereafter be so available for services in accordance with Section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) and supporting expenses, for necessary special studies and research, without regard to restrictions pertaining to the duration and manner of procurement thereof.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board is preparing to conduct a comprehensive study of the savings and loan industry and ways in

which its operations and the governmental supervisory process can be improved. This study will cover more than 1 fiscal year, and the proposed language includes authority which will facilitate the provision of financing and services necessary for its execution.

The amounts requested herein, when added to the amounts previously requested, will not increase the total for the fiscal year 1966 as shown in the 1967 budget.

I recommend that the foregoing proposals be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

○

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MARCH 29, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Col. Maurice S. Kleinberg, Chaplain, U.S. Army, Staff Chaplain, Military District of Washington, offered the following prayer:

I Chronicles 29: 11:

Thine, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the victory and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Thine; Thine is the kingdom O Lord, and Thou are exalted as head above all.

Let us pray:

O Eternal God, we stand in awe before Thee as we seek Thy blessing upon the deliberations and decisions of this day.

Humbly we beseech Thee to grant a measure of Thy divine insight unto the leaders of this great Nation so that what transpires here today and every day may reflect a measure of justice and righteousness according to Thy will.

Give us the capacity for reasonable doubt and shield us from becoming precast in the mold of inherited assumptions.

Shed Thy divine light upon our quest into the vast expanse of truth and keep us constant in our awareness that though today's accepted hypothesis may become tomorrow's fallacy, man's search for truth is not in vain.

Give us the faith that will sustain us through troubled times and bring us to that victorious day when all men as brothers shall invoke Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WORK PLAN FOR MONROE-ANNABELLA, UTAH

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

MARCH 28, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on March 22, 1966, considered the work plan Monroe-Annabella, Utah, transmitted to you by Executive Communication No. 1108, 88th Congress, and referred to this committee, and unanimously approved the plan.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program and the Subcommittee on Roads, of the Committee on Public Works, meeting jointly, be permitted to sit during general debate today and for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, all of us remember the words of our late President Kennedy, who said:

> We must never—at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words, or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.

During 1920, Byelorussia became a captive nation of Soviet Russia. Only 2 years before, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born. Yet, despite all the sacrifices of its brave people, this new nation was unable to preserve its independence against the relentless onslaught of overwhelming Communist forces.

We of the Western World have often mistakenly considered Byelorussia as a part of Russia itself. It is, however, a fact that since the beginning of history Byelorussia developed quite independently of Russia, and the Byelorussians can proudly boast of their long and glorious history which antedates the history of Russia. To preserve their independence, the Byelorussians had to endure severe trials and untold hardships over the centuries. To this day the stouthearted Byelorussians have kept their longings for freedom and independence in their hearts and minds notwithstanding the ruthless regime of their present Red overlords who take orders from the Kremlin. The Soviet authorities employed their well-tried methods against the people of that land, such as execution squads, mass deportations, and the spreading of terror.

I should like to point out that the present Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is nothing but a mere puppet of the Russian Government in Moscow and that it does not, in reality, represent the Byelorussian people.

In recognition of the right of a free people to national self-determination, the U.S. Government has firmly and consistently stood by its declared policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of once free nations. That is the reason we here in the Congress of the United States take note of the occasion of the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. The eloquent speeches made this day by our colleagues, who are the duly elected representatives of the American people, are proof positive of our concern for people who suffer aggression. We cannot, and indeed, must not, turn our backs on the less fortunate peoples of enslaved nations. Our noting of this day materially assists in forming world opinion and thus hastening the time when Byelorussia will once again achieve meaningful and true independence and freedom for its land from the evil forces which pose a threat to the entire free world.

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WOLFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Ashley	Henderson	Resnick
Battin	Holifield	Rivers, Alaska
Burleson	Huot	Rivers, S.C.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Rooney, N.Y.
Cameron	Jones, N.C.	Scheuer
Carter	Keogh	Scott
Casey	Leggett	Senner
Chelf	McMillan	Sisk
Clark	MacGregor	Smith, Iowa
Colmer	Mackie	Smith, N.Y.
Conyers	Mailliard	Stephens
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Todd
Duncan, Oreg.	Matthews	Toll
Farnum	Moss	Walker, Miss.
Fuqua	Murray	Willis
Hall	Nix	Wright
Hanna	O'Konski	
Harvey, Ind.	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14012), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate thereon be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14012, with Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, last week we concluded consideration of the first supplemental appropriation bill of this year, a bill providing $13 billion plus for the continued prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

Today, we begin consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year 1966, and although it is considerably smaller in size, it will be considerably more controversial among the Members of the House.

This is very good indeed. At times I despair over the lack of a broad enough interest in the country in the money bills which are presented to the Congress and in national fiscal affairs generally.

Appropriation bills ought to be thoroughly discussed. There should be deep probing of the consequences of these actions of the Congress. When we take action, we ought to take action deliberately after full consideration. So I hope that the reports which have been in the press are correct, and that we will have a thorough discussion of Federal fiscal policy in connection with the consideration of this bill.

If we are going to discuss the bill adequately, it would seem to me that the first thing we should do is to ascertain generally what is in the bill.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE BILL

I would like to turn to page 2 of the report accompanying the bill and briefly outline what the bill provides.

The bill calls for the appropriation of $2.5 billion plus. Let us break it down into compartments and see just what is in it.

The total amount is $2.5 billion—precisely, $2,564,872,568. Now, if there is very serious opposition to the bill, I assume that probably amendments will be offered to reduce it by half a billion dollars, or something of that general magnitude. That is, to cut it back from $2.5 billion possibly to $2 billion. If this bill is bad, let us operate on it, in the public interest. If it is good, then let us endorse it and vote for it. I say to you that I think the bill, on balance, is reasonably good. It is a creature of numerous compromises. No one achieved everything he wanted. Each of those who help to write the bill is disappointed to some extent.

So here we are. If there is something radically wrong with the bill, certainly amendments to reduce it by hundreds of millions of dollars will be presented and Members will have a chance to vote on them according to their views.

There is half a billion dollars in the bill—$552,600,000 to be more exact—or 21 percent of the total recommended, for mandatory-type expenditures under laws enacted prior to the first session of this Congress, that is, prior to the first session of the 89th Congress. At this stage, provisions of these funds is more or less a matter of arithmetic. We have no real discretion at this point. Included among these funds is $381,000,000 for public assistance matching grants and $136,000,000 for veterans' compensation and pensions of one kind or another.

Congress, in its actions last year, assumed that with rising employment the need for public assistance would be diminished from the amount then budgeted, and we cut the request for public assistance by $242 million.

But it turned out, despite the high level of economic growth and activity the requirements for public assistance did not decrease so we had to put this money back because under the matching provisions of the law there was no alternative. Such mandatory items make up 21 percent of the bill.

Approximately $1.1 billion of the funds recommended in the bill, or almost half of it, 46 percent to be more precise, is for the cost of increased pay rates enacted in the last session for military and civilian personnel. That takes up $1,171,400,000 of the total. This could not be put in the original fiscal 1966 budget last year because the laws had not been enacted. I think more than 90 percent of the Members voted for the military pay increase, and the increased pay for civilian workers passed easily. The executive branch is absorbing 11 percent of the cost of the military pay raise and 32 percent of the cost of the civilian pay raise. The pay increases have been running since last fall, so we have no practical alternative to this $1.1 billion. These two categories, 46 percent for pay for military and civilian personnel, and 21 percent for mandatory-type expenditures, total 67 percent or roughly about two-thirds of the funds in the whole bill.

There is $694,300,000 in this bill, or 27 percent of the total recommended which is related to legislation, other than pay acts, enacted in the last session of Congress.

The minority views talk about new starts and say that we should not have any. If the programs I have placed in this category are interpreted as new starts, perhaps someone will want to move to strike out half a billion dollars, or more, of the $694 million that is provided here.

We can discuss this if we want to. Roughly half of this amount, $335 million, is nondiscretionary at this stage, involving additional veterans' compensation and pensions and the extra obligations incurred under an over-allotment formula written into the new elementary and secondary education appropriation last year.

Mr. Chairman, another $125.8 million is associated with the health insurance or medicare program.

So, Mr. Chairman, as a very practical matter, there seems to be little room here in which to make further substantial reductions.

Mr. Chairman, $146,600,000 in this bill, which represents 6 percent of the total, is for the kinds of items generally thought of when supplemental appropriation bills are mentioned. For instance, Mr. Chairman, for the postal service, where the volume of business is increasing, $81 million is provided. Another item is $45 million with which to replenish the President's Disaster Relief Fund.

Mr. Chairman, certainly no one would propose slicing off amounts as small as $10 million, or $20 million, or $30 million, of this bill and claim to be making a really major reduction in the rate of public spending.

This is the general nature of the items in the bill now pending before us.

I believe it is very healthy as I said in the beginning, for us to discuss fully the fiscal affairs of the Government.

THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1967

The President, in submitting his fiscal 1967 budget, cut very deeply into many programs.

The President used the paring knife upon the budget requests of the departments, carving out billions of dollars of funds that they had requested. He made some choices—painful choices. He used considerable restraint. Members of the Congress who have spoken to me from day to day have expressed more concern about the cuts that were made by the President than about the amounts that were requested.

Thus I believe that the problem in this Congress, probably, will be to hold the

line on the President's budget. The likelihood of exceeding it may be much greater than the likelihood that the budget will be reduced.

Mr. Chairman, it can clearly be shown that the President made some basic and meaningful cuts in preparing his fiscal 1967 budget. The members of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as other Members of Congress, are now in the process of evaluating these reductions. Committee hearings are well advanced on the various departmental items.

I have before me a compilation of recently enacted authorizations and budget requests that were made thereunder by the President in the budget for 1967.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, copies of this hearing book to which I am referring are available and are on the Committee table.

In the Federal Aviation Agency's Federal aid to airports program, for which the authorization for 1967 is $75 million, $71,100,000 has been appropriated and the 1967 Budget requests recision of $21 million, leaving $50 million or two-thirds of the authorized amount.

Mr. Chairman, the point I would make is that a lot of restraint has been used by the President and by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in making up this 1967 budget. The difference between the available recently enacted authorizations that we have provided and the amount requested is more than $2 billion. A great deal of restraint was exercised before this budget came to us.

Another example, Mr. Chairman, is the item for sewer and water grants. Sewer and water grants are very popular with our constituents and Members of the House. The full program authorized for fiscal 1967, is $200 million. But what did the President do? He sliced it in half; that is what he did.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I would be glad to yield to the geneltman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure that the gentleman from Texas realizes there is more money in the 1967 budget, however, for sewer and water grants, than was available in the 1966 budget, because of the program changes and the program shifts to other areas in which this same kind of grant exists. Insofar as the airport money is concerned, what the President is asking for is to rescind $21 million of authority that already exists insofar as the airports are concerned.

That is a rescinding authority to spend in this particular area, but it still at a level higher than the current level.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is helping me to make my point, and that is that the President did use a great deal of restraint in making reductions before this budget came us us. I have mentioned the Federal aid airport program and the sewer and water grants. We could mention a great number of other programs here. There is a long list in this hearing book I have in my hand.

Vocational education in the 1967 budget has been held to $249 million, as compared to the permissable ceiling of $318 million.

It is very obvious that the President is trying to hold spending within bounds and for that reason has submitted requests far below what would otherwise probably have been submitted what could have been submitted within the authorization laws, except for the necessity to exercise restraint in view of the threat of inflation and the costs and the seriousness of the Vietnam situation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Texas realizes, however, that this budget is an increase and we are well over the figure for 1966 with this authorization. We hear a lot of talk about how low authorizations were going to be kept in the fiscal year 1966. We are well over $125 billion in new obligational authority when this bill passes today.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman knows that the estimated budget expenditure for the current fiscal year 1966 is about $106 billion. The presently estimated budget expenditure for fiscal year 1967 is $112 billion, plus. The appropriation budget for the current fiscal year 1966, including this bill today, is for $128 billion, plus.

It is true that the costs of the war in Vietnam and other costs have run up the expenses of Government. There is no controversy about that. But what I am trying to say is that the President, in submitting his budget, exercised restraint and did not request the total amounts authorized and available for him to request within the legislative enactments of the Congress.

A further specific example is the highway beautification program. The authorization available for fiscal year 1967 for highway beautification is $160 million.

The President confined the request for highway beautification work to $90 million for 1967.

So you will see examples such as that throughout the budget.

There has been a great deal of restraint in the formulation of the budget that has already been submitted to us.

Under leave to extend, I am including the full list from which I have been picking examples at random.

The following is taken from pages 62 to 64, hearings of January 31, 1966, by the Committee on Appropriations, on the budget for 1967:

NEW LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS IN 1966 NOT FULLY FUNDED IN 1967 BUDGET

Mr. MAHON. Now I wish you would make a list of new legislation of last year that this budget fails to fund to the full authorization, pointing out the disparities.

Mr. SCHUTZE. I have such a list.

(The following was furnished for the record:)

Comparison of available authorizations and the 1967 budget request

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorization available in 1967	1967 budget request (NOA)
Commerce:		
Economic Development Administration:		
Development facility grants	500.0	170.0
Economic development revolving fund	170.0	81.0
Economic Development Center assistance	50.0	40.0
Technical assistance and planning grants	25.0	19.0
Regional planning assistance	15.0	7.0
Total, Public Works and Economic Development Act (Public Law 89-136)	760.0	317.0
Office of State Technical Services (Public Law 89-182)	20.0	8.0
High-speed ground transportation research and development (Public Law 89-220)	35.0	24.0
Highway beautification (Public Law 89-139):		
Landscaping and scenic enhancement	120.0	60.0
Control of outdoor advertising	20.0	15.0
Control of junkyards	20.0	15.0
Total, highway beautification	160.0	90.0
Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (various agencies):		
Agriculture	14.0	4.5
Commerce:		
Development highways	[1] 160.0	130.0
Other	7.0	5.0
Corps of Engineers	4.0	2.0
Health, Education, and Welfare	59.0	13.0
Interior	19.0	11.0
Appalachian Regional Commission	1.0	1.0
Total, Appalachian Regional Development Act	305.0	201.0
Health, Education, and Welfare:		
Vocational Rehabilitation:		
Research, training, and expansion	[1] 104.0	67.0
Other	23.0	13.0
Office of Education:		
Impacted areas:		
Operating grants	416.2	183.4
Construction grants	22.9	22.9

Footnotes at end of table.

Comparison of available authorizations and the 1967 budget request— Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorization available in 1967	1967 budget request (NOA)
Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued		
Office of Education—Continued		
National Defense Education Act:		
Student loans	201.0	[3] 0
School equipment and related programs	99.0	63.0
Graduate fellowships	89.0	82.0
Guidance counseling and training	37.0	32.0
Language and area studies	16.0	16.0
Research in educational media	5.0	4.0
Teacher institutes	50.0	40.0
State statistical programs	2.0	2.0
Subtotal, NDEA	500.0	239.0
Vocational education	318.0	249.0
Higher educational activities:		
Community service and continuing education	50.0	20.0
College library grants	50.0	25.0
Library research and training grants	10.0	7.0
Library of Congress	6.0	3.0
Scholarship grants	124.0	122.0
Work study grants	165.0	134.0
Teacher fellowships	160.0	43.0
Teacher Corps	65.0	31.0
Instructional equipment	66.0	17.0
Subtotal, higher education	696.0	402.0
Grants to land-grant colleges	12.0	0
Training of teachers and research relating to education of the handicapped	38.0	33.0
Public Health Service:		
Medical education:		
Construction grants for medical-dental schools	160.0	135.0
Loans for medical-dental and nursing students	42.0	[3] 0
Improvement grants to medical-dental schools	40.0	30.0
Support to diploma schools of nursing	10.0	6.0
Support to schools of professional public health training	5.0	4.0
Community immunization	11.0	9.0
Hospital and medical facility research	10.0	7.0
Solid waste disposal program (HEW portion)	14.0	11.0
Community mental health staffing grants	40.0	34.0
Construction community mental health centers	65.0	50.0
Health research facilities construction grants	[4] 280.0	15.0
Regional medical program	90.0	43.0
Medical Library Assistance Act	23.0	14.0
(Construction grants)	(10.0)	(7.0)
(Regional and branch libraries)	(4.0)	(0)
(Research and development)	(3.0)	(1.0)
Welfare Administration:		
Grants for child welfare	50.0	46.0
Training grants for professional personnel	5.0	4.0
Administration on Aging: Grants to States	8.0	6.0
Veterans' Administration: Grants for construction of State nursing homes	5.0	4.0

	Authorization available in 1967	Portion becoming available	1967 budget request
Housing and Urban Development:			
I. Appropriations:			
Urban planning grants	117		35
Community development training grants	30		5
Sewer and water grants	300	200	100
Advance land acquisition	45	25	5
Neighborhood facilities grants	88	50	25
Public works planning advances	45		
Rehabilitation loans	160	100	
Urban transportation [5]	185	150	130
Housing for the elderly loans	175		50
II. Other new obligational authority becoming available in 1967:			
College housing loans (borrowing authority)		[6] 300	[7]—300
FNMA—Special assistance functions (borrowing authority)		[6] 450	[7]—450
Urban renewal grants (contract authority)		[6] 725	
III. Additional authorities:			
Rent supplement payments [8]	65	35	35
Public housing annual contribution	460	47	260
Federal Aviation Agency: Federal-aid airport program [9]	75		50

[1] $840,000,000 authorized for 5 years; $200,000,000 appropriated for 1965 and 1966: amount assumes $160,000,000 for each of remaining 3 years.
[2] Represents authorization ceiling, not a 1967 guideline.
[3] The budget contemplates proposed legislation to terminate direct student loans and to continue (1) aid for college students through guaranteed loans (for which capital is supplied by the private credit market) and (2) special cancellation benefits for doctors, nurses, and teachers.
[4] For 3 years.
[5] 1967 NOA provided in 1966 appropriations act.
[6] Authority enacted in Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.
[7] Receipts from proposed sales of participations in pools of loans will permit a cancellation of NOA otherwise becoming available.
[8] Amounts represent maximum annual payments that may be provided in rent supplement contracts.
[9] $75,000,000 is authorized. Congress enacted advance authority (as is customary) of $71,000,000. The 1967 budget proposes to rescind $21,000,000 of this amount.

Yesterday there came to your desks, my colleagues, a document entitled "Federal Spending Facts," from the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. This is a very conservative organization. Members of the council in this report, which I hold in my hand—it is dated March 28—they say with respect to the antipoverty program:

It is probable that the budget request for 1967 would have been at least $2 billion instead of $1,750 million if it had not been for the substantial expansion of defense spending.

So, this reduction is taken account of and credited in this very conservative publication.

Reading further from this publication:

The budgeted appropriation for this program—

And the program being referred to is for the clementary and secondary education—

The budgeted appropriation for this program in 1967 would undoubtedly have been appreciably greater than proposed except for the rising Vietnam war needs.

Here is a conservative and well-known organization that by these statemcnts tends to corroborate what I have been trying to say, that the President desires to keep Government expenditures from getting completely out of line. The President is trying to hold the lid on.

Further evidence that he is keeping at the departments to hold spending down is shown by a memorandum which the President sent to the heads of the departments and agencies of Government only 2 weeks ago—March 15. He said to them, and I quote:

Last November, I wrote certain departments and agencies that it was imperative to hold 1966 expenditures to the absolute minimum required for carrying out essential responsibilities.

Of course, everyone realizes that big Government spending is inevitable for a great and growing country in times like this, with a war and all the problems that confront us.

Continuing in this memorandum, the President said:

Today, the need is doubly imperative. As the rising costs of Vietnam are added to the private demands generated by a prosperous highly employed economy, the necessity to guard against inflation takes on added urgency.

In this period, your careful control over every dollar of Government spending will not only avoid direct waste of our resources, but will also help prevent the indirect and inequitable waste that results from the deterioration of the dollar's value.

The executive branch is acutely conscious of the problems of inflation, conscious of the problems of big government, and conscious of the pressures that great sums be expended; and the President is trying to hold the line.

I am hopeful that when this Congress is over that we will have held the line and not exceeded the President's budget. That is probably one of the major problems that is going to confront us as this session moves along. We ought to find ways to restrain our fiscal inclinations and do everything reasonably prudent as we process these appropriation bills.

I hope that Members will give much consideration to the matter.

There has been some talk about one item of this $2.5 billion bill which we are considering today. I understand that an amendment will be offered to delete the $12 million for the so-called rent supplement program. That would not be a very big slash in a $2.5 billion bill. It would be a small reduction in the pending bill but, of course, the implications of this decision could run to about $480

million in 40 years. But this is a question which I think we should give some thought to as we consider this bill.

Last year, Congress approved the authorization for the rent supplement program. Maybe you did not vote for it; I did not vote for it. But it was approved by Congress, and the bill was signed by the President. We had a vigorous debate on this subject in the House in consideration of the appropriation bill last year, and the House cut out the appropriation for the rent supplement program. The Appropriations Committee has scaled down the amount. The committee had circumscribed it within certain limitations and brought in a very reduced program. Nevertheless, the House rejected the program. Admittedly there was much uncertainty as to what the regulations really were to be.

The bill then went to the other body and the other body put money into the bill for the rent supplement program. But the House Members opposed the actions of the other body and the House position preaviled in conference. We wanted to proceed with caution in connection with this new and expensive program. We were not satisfied.

Here is what those who favored the program and those who were against the program said in the conference report on October 21, 1965, in House Report No. 1198:

> Funds for rent supplements are denied at this time without prejudice.

We have to agree to something in conference if we are going to move legislation. The report further stated:

> Congress has only recently authorized legislation for this program and the new Department should have more time to develop sound plans and criteria which can be reviewed when funds are sought early next year.

Officials have now developed firmer plans and the situation is improved over what it was last year. As explained in the committee report on the pending bill:

> Subsequent to consideration of this proposition by the Congress last fall, much has been done to clarify issues raised at that time. Rent supplement payments will be made to owners or developers of certain private housing in order to help make more housing available to low-income persons. The Secretary has clearly stated that only those of low income will be helped. In no case will income limits be above those established for low-rent public housing. An asset limitation has been set at $2,000 for low-income families, or $5,000 in the case of the elderly.

It is now late March. The committee has finally, after cautious, careful consideration and hearings, brought in a rent supplement appropriation. The President's request has been scaled down from $30 million to $12 million by the committee, and restrictions have been written in. It would seem to me that, as a compromise matter, we have done as well as we could with a difficult situation.

We all know that for many decades our cities have been blighted with horrible and unspeakable slums. Some of us try constantly to do something about the farm program. We provide $4 billion annually for support of various farm programs. We are interested primarily in rural areas. But we must be interested also in urban areas, if we are to fulfill our national obligations.

Our leaders generally, Democrats and Republicans alike, have tried to find a remedy for the slum situation which has confronted this Nation for generations. We all know that the slums are the spawning ground for much of the crime in this country. Of course, they are not the only spawning ground for crime. We have both the underprivileged and the overprivileged who break the law. But certainly, the conditions involved in the slum areas of our Nation does cost us a lot of money in productivity losses and in losses due to crime and the cost of crime prevention.

Many years ago, in 1937, we enacted the public housing program. Some of us voted against it. I did. But nevertheless, this program has undoubtedly done some good and has cleaned up some of the blighted spots. To date it has cost about $1.8 billion. If we should carry out all of the present commitments over the period of the next 30 or 40 years, it will cost us about $10 billion over that long period.

Public Housing has been expensive and it has not, of course, fully solved the problem, but it has been an effort to solve the problem.

We cannot brush under the rug the existence of this problem and we cannot gloss over the fact that slums are costing the American taxpayers many billions of dollars.

J. Edgar Hoover said that crime is costing us $27 billion a year. Crime does not all, of course, result from slums. I would not indicate that at all. But much of it is the result of inadequate and improper living conditions in the crowded urban areas of our Nation.

Democrats and Republicans alike have been knitting their brows for years, trying to figure out a better answer to the situation.

Last year, the Congress approved the rent supplement approach to the problem. This was different from the public housing approach. This is the free enterprise type approach, in which taxes will be paid on the property in the regular way, the property will be privately owned, and the owner will have a direct stake in the success of it.

This approach was approved by the Congress. The Committee on Appropriations, in view of the law enacted and the will, I believe, of the majority of the Members, has brought in a limited start for this program.

Let me quote from the hearings before our committee on this bill, from page 315. Many feel that public housing ought to be phased out and that we ought to embrace the rent supplement approach instead.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] appeared before the subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]. Mr. STEPHENS spoke ardently in favor of the rent supplement program. In the colloquy which took place between him and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]—and there is no finer Member of the House, no more able and dedicated Member of the House, and nobody more familiar with the situation than Mr. JONAS, a member of the committee. Mr. JONAS said:

> I think this program is superior to public housing, and agree with much of what you said except I am not satisfied that this program will replace public housing.

I hope it could replace much of public housing. But here is an authority in the House saying that, whatever we think about the rent supplement program, it is superior to the public housing program.

The political platforms of both parties have talked about the problem of the slums and the need for better housing.

The 1965 Democratic platform said:

> The goal of our housing program must be a decent home for every American family.

The Republican platform committee of 1964 was chaired by the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who himself is a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations. In the Republican platform the following language appears urging "emphasis upon channeling more private capital into sound urban development projects and private housing."

That is in the Republican platform. It is somewhat comparable to the rent supplement program—not entirely so.

The Republican platform complained, referring to the Democratic administration:

> This administration has refused to take practical free enterprise measures to help the poor.

The rent supplement program is designed to be a free enterprise measure to help the poor. Whether it is practical or not is up to us to decide. But we were importuned to take steps in this general direction by the Republican platform.

The Republican platform stated further, referring to the Democratic Party;

> It has failed to stimulate new housing and attract more private capital into the field. In the past 3 years, it has fallen short by 1,500,000 units of meeting its pledge of 2 million new homes each year.

The bill before us is a compromise measure. The President asked for $30 million. We provide here for the $12 million amount, with very firm restrictions, which we think will avoid some difficulties. As a result of the give and take among reasonable men, this is the program which is submitted to you today.

Furthermore, this program has a much greater opportunity to succeed because of the limitations which we have placed in the bill.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has talked about the limitations that have been placed into this bill for the rent supplement program. Will the gentleman detail those for us?

Mr. MAHON. The restrictions recommended by the committee is to insure that local communities will have a voice in the operation of this program. The committee believes that if the program is to be successful it will have to have

acceptance by the local communities. They will have to participate. If they do not want it, they do not have to have it. After all, the local people know their problems and needs better than anyone else.

The bill provides that rent supplement projects be part of a workable program—a provision applied to many other urban programs—or be officially approved by the local community concerned. This has been a dominant theme in recent legislation and the bill today includes rent supplements under this concept.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. I think the gentleman recognizes that buildings do not make slums. It is people that make slums.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the time has come for our Committee on Appropriations—and for that matter, the entire Congress—to fish or cut bait in our handling of the administration's appropriation requests for the balance of this year and for all of the 1967 fiscal year.

I, for one, am ready to do some fishing to see if we cannot arrest the expansions of Great Society programs and expansions of other nonessential or low-priority domestic spending.

If we in Congress do otherwise, we shall be encouraging disastrous inflation or the imposition of additional taxes on an already tax-burdened public.

The New York Times yesterday quotes an administration aid as saying that this is D-day insofar as domestic spending programs are concerned this year. I say, let us accept that designation. If this is D-day on domestic spending, let us demonstrate our determination to wage and win a battle against extravagance in time of war. It will be a great victory for the American taxpayer.

It is apparent from the supplemental requests for 1966 and the budget requests for 1967 that the administration has made no plans to curtail any Great Society spending and very little in other domestic spending. The budget-cutting proposals it has made in the 1967 budget are largely directed toward programs of considerable appeal to the public. Moreover, if I have correctly interpreted the mood of House Members with respect to cutting some of the public's more favored and longstanding programs, I think it is safe to assume that the planned reductions will not be realized, as my distinguished chairman has said.

In time of war—and make no mistake about it, we are at war in Vietnam just as surely as we were at war in the forties and in the early fifties—the administration and the Congress have an obligation to the American people to adequately finance the war and, at the same time, practice economy here at home rather than just pay lipservice to it, as the administration has done to date.

Our Nation has a commitment in Vietnam, which will require the services—and in some instances the limbs and lives—of a great many more of our young men. It will also require much additional war material, which will constitute a drain on our resources and a strain on our economy. We have no choice but to provide the men and material to defeat the enemy and restore peace to a troubled world. But we do have a choice—in fact in my opinon an obligation—to protect the economic well-being of our great Nation from the ravages of inflation, from the awesome burden of increased taxation, and from the chains of statutory wage and price controls—which at best are the ineffective tools of a bungling bureaucracy.

If we are to honor that obligation to the Nation's economic stability, we should begin now to curtail the excesses in Federal spending for domestic programs.

WHAT IS THE RECORD ON DEFENSE NEEDS?

It is obvious that our defense needs and expenditures were understated in the January budget of last year and they are underestimated in the fiscal 1967 budget. They were understated last year to pave the way for Great Society spending proposals and to preserve the facade of a $100 billion budget for 1966. They are underestimated for fiscal 1967 to pave the way for expansions of Great Society programs and to support the fiction of a $1.8 billion administrative budget deficit.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for pointing out the underestimation of defense needs as far as the 1966 budget is concerned. This request which we have before us today is the third add-on for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1966 and the fourth add-on so far considered by this 89th Congress. The 1967 budget was out of date 2 days after it was sent to this Congress as far as our national security needs are concerned. I think it is necessary for all Americans to understand that most clearly, especially on a day when the administration announced that the cost of living has increased by another one-half of 1 percent.

But in our hearings it has already been developed—and I believe the gentleman from Ohio shares this concern with me and with other Members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle—that the national security needs of our country are still underestimated, not only as far as new obligational authority is concerned, but insofar as the expenditures are concerned.

The manpower limit on the Department of the Army was removed 2 days after the budget was sent to us. This, in expenditures as well as new obligational authority, will mean over $1 billion, and those supplementals for fiscal 1967 are already under consideration in the Department of Defense at this very moment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the concern that every Member of the Congress should share at this time—the fact that new obligational authority was underestimated in 1966 by over $15 billion, and new obligational authority, as well as expenditures, have already been proven to be underestimated insofar as 1967 is concerned.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin.

In May of last year, a little more than a month before the 1965 fiscal year ended, we were presented with a $700 million supplemental defense appropriation request which Congress enacted immediately. If that request had been provided for in the 1966 budget, no harm, whatsoever, would have been done to our war effort. In August when the Senate had the regular defense appropriation bill under consideration, the administration sent us a further appropriation request for an additional $1.7 billion, which Congress approved. And it was only last week that we gave final approval to the President's request for $13.1 billion of additional defense appropriations for the balance of this fiscal year, which ends next June 30.

It is a virtual certainty that we will be called upon to honor additional defense supplementals late in this calendar year or early next year.

The administration should be requested to furnish the Congress with a more realistic assessment to our overall national security needs for fiscal 1967. It should also establish a schedule of priorities on domestic spending to the end that those of low priority could be deferred, at least until a just peace is reached in Vietnam. If the administration is unwilling to provide the Congress with a reassessment of defense needs and expenditures and a schedule of priorities on domestic spending, then I think we shall be forced to do it for them and for the good of the economy.

WHAT IS AHEAD?

Inflation is already eroding the purchasing power of the dollar. The wholesale price index was up seven-tenths of 1 percent in February—and every housewife knows that the price of food is increasing steadily.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin just said, we now have a one-half of 1 percent increase in the cost of living for this year, and for the balance of the year, if it continues, we will have a 6-percent inflation on the basis of the figures that we have up to this date. This inflation will represent an additional 6-percent tax increase, actually, upon the American people.

The administration is concerned over the inflationary pressures that are building steadily. Only last week the President was quoted in the press as having ruled out the possibility of new taxes at this time. He did not, however, rule out the possibility of tax increases later in the year.

Now, we all know that inflation is a pernicious form of taxation that has its

greatest impact upon middle-income citizens and upon the very same low-income citizens that the Great Society programs are intended to help. To halt the upward spiral of inflation by imposing further taxes on these low-income citizens would constitute an artful and scandalous trick of giving with one hand and taking away with the other.

There is a much fairer way of halting the upward spiral of inflation. If the administration and the Congress will just slow down the rate of increase in controllable, nondefense domestic spending, inflation can be contained and we can continue to have relative stability in wages and prices in 1967.

If as planned, the administration pumps into the economy an additional $10 billion of cash payments to the public over and above the $135 billion scheduled for this year, there will be little or no hope that we can contain inflation except through tax increases.

If Congress goes blindly along with the administration on its nondefense spending plans for 1967, the administrative budget deficit will very likely be nearer $5 billion than the $1.8 billion forecast by the administration.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I was interested in the comment of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio about inflation. My collection is that there was some announcement made yesterday or last night about the continuing increases in the cost of living.

Mr. BOW. I have just referred to that. It is one-half of 1 percent. This would amount to about 6 percent increase this year, when expressed on an annual basis.

Mr. JONAS. That is on an annual basis?

Mr. BOW. Yes.

If the Congress goes along with the administration, I think we are going to have a $5 billion deficit excluding Vietnam. It is unlikely that the Department of Defense can sustain the $1.6 billion of planned defense economies in 1967.

It is reasonably certain that the administration will not be able to market all of the $4.7 billion of Government loan assets it has set aside for sale. That is figured in the budget to keep it at $1.8 billion. Already, administration officials are contacting Members of Congress for their support of Federal discounts—subsidies—to make these assets more attractive to the banking community. In other words, we will pay subsidies to increase interest so the banks will buy these assets. With interest rates on the upswing, discounts would have to be large enough to produce about an 8-percent return before the assets could be made attractive to bankers. And even then, some banks would not participate simply because they would be unwilling to invest in assets that were of questionable investment value when they were originally negotiated even though we give them a subsidy.

Interest on the public debt will rise more rapidly than was forecast in the budget for 1967 coming out again with a higher deficit.

Savings of $268 million of expenditures in 1967 on longstanding and public-favored programs such as school lunch, school milk, land-grant colleges, impact school aid, and cooperative-State research in agriculture probably will not be realized.

The 1967 budget is misleading in that it implies a fiscal program that is in near balance, and it is inflationary because of its expansionary thrust, particularly in the Great Society programs.

THE BILL BEFORE US

The second supplemental appropriation bill, which we are discussing today, would provide $2.5 billion of appropriations, a reduction of $249 million from the budget request of $2.8 billion. The reductions from budget requests largely constitute paper or bookkeeping cuts since over $200 million was cut from the request for budget funds to finance the supplementary medical insurance trust fund and the Federal hospital insurance trust fund. To the extent that additional funds are needed for these trust accounts, we shall be obliged to provide them.

This bill provides funds for the initiation of nine new programs which were authorized by Congress last year and extension of four programs under legislation also enacted last year. As desirable as these programs may seem, I do think the rates of their financing could have been held down to lower levels without adverse effect on operation of the programs. Certainly, there is no pressing need, in fact as I see it, no need at all for funds to initiate the National Teacher Corps and the rent supplement program. Once these programs are funded, they will grow by leaps and bounds. They are included in the 1967 budget for substantial increases above the funds provided in this supplemental for 1966. I also seriously question the provision of $41 million for impact school aid.

I know what a favorite that is with many Members of this Congress—that there was no budget request and that the President asked you not to put it in.

In many impact school aid areas, Federal activities are largely responsible for their economic well-being.

I will have something to say on that later in the day. The administration did not request these funds and I feel the committee made a mistake by including them.

Further meaningful reductions could be made in this bill if it were given additional study by the committee.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I should repeat that we are on the threshold of runaway inflation. The administration apparently expects to halt this inflationary thrust by requesting the imposition of additional taxes on an already tax-burdened public. The administration and the Congress can halt this spread of inflation by cutting back on appropriations and expenditures for domestic spending. We have an obligation to the American public to do just that. If the administration is unwilling to honor that obligation, then we in Congress should do it for them.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has discussed in detail this second supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are four items in this supplemental appropriation bill included in chapter II—the Independent Offices Appropriations.

Let me discuss each of these four items briefly.

First. The Selective Service System requested a supplemental appropriation of $12,681,000—our committee has approved $10,180,000—we have made a cut and reduction of $2,501,000.

Most of the increases recommended are for selectee travel. Our subcommittee has been advised that the draft call of 36,000 last January has been reduced to 22,000 in April. There is thus a reduction in the number of draftees and selectees. Moreover, General Hershey proposed increasing and "beefing up" the draft boards by 880 new jobs. We felt that, as the boards are operative at this time, this number was not needed. And so we have, for these reasons, cut and reduced the fund request of Selective Service System.

The committee feels that the $10,180,000 is adequate as the regular bill is pending currently before the Congress.

Second. The Veterans' Administration has requested $188 million for compensation and pensions and $5 million for readjustment benefits—a total of $193 million.

Let me remind my colleagues that in the last session the Congress passed five new legislative measures, providing substantial increased benefits for our veterans. These measures provided for increased compensation and pensions, increased disability compensation rates, death gratuity payments up to $5,000 each to beneficiaries of veterans who died in service between January 1, 1957, and September 28, 1965.

And there were other liberalized benefits. By an act of Congress 4 million men who served in the Armed Forces were made veterans—4 million new veterans. And there are a lot of additional men being discharged adding to the veterans' rolls daily.

We have provided all the funds requested in this supplemental for the Veterans' Administration.

There are no funds or salaries for administration. All the funds are for benefits. And one more reminder—there will be other increases in veterans' benefits soon to be presented to the Congress for the new GI bill—for the cold war veterans benefits bill recently signed into law.

Third. Disaster relief: The Office of Emergency Planning asked for $75 million for additional payments for disaster relief.

Our committee has approved $45 million—we have made a cut of $30 million.

There were 12 major disasters in 16 States last year—the highest ever. As a consequence the present disaster relief fund has been reduced. Most payments have been made. However, there is a balance on hand of some $13,500,000. Annual appropriations to this fund in this fiscal year will be $100 million.

Our committee feels that the $45 million recommended will be adequate.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. Chairman, concerning the rent supplement program, our committee is recommending $12 million for contracting authority and $100,000 for payments.

We have reduced the funds budgeted for this program by $18 million.

The rent supplement program has been authorized by Congress for a period of 4 years.

The 4-year authorized program is as follows: $30 million contract authority for fiscal year 1966; $35 million for fiscal year 1967; $40 million of fiscal year 1968; $45 million for fiscal year 1969.

That is a total authorization by the Congress of $150 million in contract authority through 1969.

We have approved only $12 million for this year. This will provide for 20,000 units of the 250,000 units authorized.

This program has been authorized by Congress. It is needed it is necessary. And the funds here recommended should be approved.

FREE ENTERPRISE

The rent supplement program has been discussed and aired for months and at great length. The basic issue has already been resolved by Congress. The rent supplement program is a move in the direction away from public housing.

This program will shift the emphasis in housing assistance from public housing to free enterprise. This trend is both desirable and healthy.

I repeat: There is a great need for housing in the low-income field.

There is a housing shortage in this area.

And private enterprise is being called upon to help to provide this housing.

Private enterprise will construct the housing.

Private enterprise will own the housing.

Private enterprise will maintain and operate the housing.

The property will remain on the local tax rolls—and local and State taxes will be paid on the properties.

None of these things occur in public housing programs.

The best approach to the problem of a shortage of low-income housing is a joint Government-free enterprise effort in the rent supplement program. This places the basic responsibility for construction—for ownership—and for management and operation—on private enterprise.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Is it not true that in addition to private enterprise there are also church groups, cooperative groups, and organizations of that kind which seek the privilege and the right to build housing for lower income people?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. There is great interest in the program.

The long-range effect of the program will be to reduce emphasis on public housing. In this connection, I would like to point out that the Federal Government has been in the rent supplement business for more than 25 years in the public housing program—since the Housing Act of 1937.

The basic objections raised against this rent supplement program last year have been resolved.

INCOME AND ASSET LIMITATIONS

The program is tied to public housing—or below public housing—in the amount of income and assets allowed for persons to be eligible.

The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development has set an asset level at $2,000 for an individual or a family to be eligible for rent supplements—or $5,000 for the elderly.

Dr. Weaver, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has stated this plainly and firmly in testimony before our committee.

He has drawn regulations to this effect.

And I have a letter from Dr. Weaver confirming this fact in writing.

I repeat: Only those with assets of $2,000 or less—or $5,000 in case of the elderly—will be able to qualify for rent supplements.

This is below the standards set for public housing.

An individual with assets of $5,000 can get into public housing—which is owned, controlled, and managed by Government.

An individual with assets of this amount—$5,000—cannot qualify for the rent supplement program. If an applicant for a rent supplement has assets of $2,025, he cannot get in.

I repeat: Asset limitations are set at $2,000 for an individual or family—and at $5,000 for the elderly—below the requirements for public housing occupancy.

So, Mr. Chairman, the objections raised to this program last year have been resolved. And the assurance that these objections have been resolved is given in testimony, in regulations, and in writing.

In addition to asset limitations, persons must meet the following statutory conditions to be eligible.

They must be either displaced by Government action; 62 years of age or older; handicapped; occupying substandard housing; or to be a disaster victim in a disaster area. These standards are written into the law.

WORKABLE PROGRAM

In addition to these standards written into the law, Mr. Chairman, and the assets and income limitations set by regulation—the Committee on Appropriations has added the workable program concept to the rent supplement program.

We are all familiar with the workable program concept.

This has been written into all phases of the public housing program—into slum clearance, into urban renewal, and into other housing programs.

Our committee has added language in this bill limiting the use of funds under this program—and I quote "to those projects which are either part of a workable program or which have been officially approved by the local community concerned."

This action serves to strengthen local planning and assures local participation similar to that in other programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

All of us are familiar with the slums and the ghettos and the substandard housing situation that exists in many of our big cities and in other areas throughout the country.

We are so familiar and so much aware of this situation that a lengthy discussion should not be required to emphasize this problem of housing for low-income groups.

All 50 States have expressed an interest in the private enterprise concept of building the additional, needed housing.

The special task force that studied this program has found that 342 localities in all of the 50 States are needing additional housing. They have indicated an interest in the rent supplement program.

Some 560 projects are pending.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut—a valued member of our committee.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks, and say this: It is true that we have been engaged in the public housing program for many years. Under this rent supplement program we are trying to find a new approach to the solution to the problem. Is that so?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GIAIMO. I think it should be clearly understood, Mr. Chairman, by the department which will administer this, since they ran into some difficulty last year in defining their qualifications for this program, that this program is designed to help those people in the low-income bracket and is designed to create a reasonable method of solving this problem—so that we can substitute this, for public housing—it should be stated that the qualifications standards should not be broadened to include people who have more assets or more income than is set forth in this program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend—the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I join with the chairman of the subcommittee in the argument he is making. I think it ought to be emphasized again, as the gentleman emphasized, that we have been subsidizing public housing for the past 25 years to the tune of billions of dollars.

As a matter of fact, in the current fiscal year, we will pay under this authority to the public housing authorities around the Nation $247 million, as a subsidy to public housing. In fiscal year 1967, the amount will jump to $260 million, as a subsidy to public housing.

This new rent supplement program is, in the judgment of this committee, one which will in the long run, give us better housing for low-income groups. I think this is a very vital program. It will tend to reduce the subsidy we are now paying to public housing.

I am sure that when Members of the House look upon this program in that fashion, they will see that this new program here, one which in the long run will improve public housing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, expressions of interest have been received for the building of from 90,000 to 100,000 units—to house families presently living in substandard housing.

A total of 6 million families currently live in substandard housing.

We are all familiar with the Watts situation in Los Angeles.

We know that recently there has been a second outbreak in Watts.

We do not want—and we do not need—any more of these acts of violence.

A solution must be found—and the rent supplement program—the private enterprise concept—is a step in the right direction.

This bill will result in the construction of much needed housing for low-income persons.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this supplemental appropriation as reported by the committee.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement evidencing the dire necessity for this legislation, but I must make an objection to this appropriation, because I think it is wholly inadequate. I think that there are so many people who are living in slum areas throughout the country that something should be done for them. I think that $12 million, as I said a moment ago, is wholly inadequate. I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time to increase this sum to $30 million, which was originally intended by the administration to be included in this bill.

So, although I want to show my appreciation for the efforts of the gentleman on the floor, I want to say to him, and I want to repeat it again and again and again, that the sum provided here is wholly inadequate, especially in view of money expended for other projects.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman recognizes that some people wanted $30 million. Some people did not want any appropriation at all. The committee agreed on a compromise figure of $12 mililon. I think this amount should be appropriated. We should stand by the committee.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. It should be pointed out that this is a supplemental appropriation for the present fiscal year and there is not much time left in this fiscal year. They want to enter into those contract obligations. They will be in and are in at the present time asking for their full amount for the coming fiscal year. It should be stressed that this is a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. We are currently hearing the Secretary and officials of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs with respect to their various programs for fiscal year 1967.

We held hearings on this item last year and again this year. The amount of funding included in the pending bill has been fully justified.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, first, although I do not see the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the committee, on the floor here now, I do want to tell him how much I appreciate his complimentary remarks. He did not read all of the RECORD or he would have found that I expressed sentiments somewhat different than those he quoted, although he did quote me accurately as saying that I think this rent subsidy program is superior to public housing. I have always said that and I repeat it today. It is superior to public housing in several respects. First, the property stays on the tax rolls. That is one of the objections to public housing. It is nontaxable to the local community which provides services. This housing will be.

Second, this housing will be managed by private management concerns or individuals. That makes it superior, because public housing is managed by public housing authorities or public bodies. It is superior also in that while the profits are limited, one classification of sponsorship is a limited dividend corporation. The profit is limited to dividends of 6 percent of the money invested. So in those respects I say again, as I did at the hearings, that I think this program is superior to public housing. If it were being offered here today as a substitute for public housing, I would have no difficulty supporting it. I think the problem we have here is that this is not offered as a substitute for public housing but it is another subsidized program superimposed on public housing.

Before I get too far into a discussion of the program, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] in saying to the Committee that the bill, or our section of the bill before you and the one to which I am now referring, was the basis of a compromise in the subcommittee.

There were those on the subcommittee who opposed the entire program. I do not mind saying that I am opposed to the program if for no other reason than that I do not think it ought to be started in a supplemental bill. We held hearings yesterday in the subcommittee on the regular appropriation bill for 1967. It has $35 million in it for an extension of this program, which is the second installment of it. There were others who wanted the full $30 million without any limiting language. In order to get the limiting language, we finally worked out a compromise to include $12 million plus the limiting language.

Now, I am not going to offer any amendments to strike it. We just heard in the committee a minute ago that an amendment will be offered to increase it. I will certainly oppose that. I will decide how to vote on other amendments when they are offered, but this is, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, the development of a compromise within the subcommittee in order to have a bill that we could report to the full committee and to this Committee of the Whole in order that it may work its will and decide what to do.

I have said that this is a program that is superimposed on public housing. I think it would be in order to remind the committee today of exactly what is involved in our commitment to public housing already. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], in his colloquy with the chairman of our subcommittee a moment ago, brought out the fact that this last year we appropriated approximately $240 million to pick up the tab, to pay the subsidy for public housing units now in occupancy. Let me show you how that is growing. That was $240 million in 1966, but do you know how far it will grow by 1967?

They are asking for $280 million in 1967, of which $260 million is subsidy and $20 million is for administrative costs. That is what it costs us, the taxpayers, just to administer the public housing per year.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the subsidy, which is growing by leaps and bounds—and I would ask those who have the feeling that this may be a program that is to be substituted for public housing—to turn to page 266 and they will see a table there, put into the RECORD by Dr. Weaver himself, which shows that instead of public housing going down as this new program is funded, public housing is scheduled to increase. It will increase over the next four years by 258,000 new units, 158,000 of which are dwelling units, 60,000 of which are acquisitions of existing structures and improvements to existing ones, and 40,000 units that will be leased.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the members of the Committee know what it costs in subsidy to run the public housing program per unit? It costs $698 a unit. This $280 million to which I have just referred, as contained in the President's budget for public housing subsidies for 1967—should be multiplied by 40, because the contracts run for 40 years—you will see that, instead of talking about $280 million, we actually should be talking about 40 times that sum. Members of the Committee will find that if they do multiply it out, it represents about $11 billion, if we do not increase the units any beyond the ones presently in existence and which are occupied today.

Mr. Chairman, I would also remind the members of the Committee that we

are talking—and the very distinguished gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, made somewhat light of the effort that will be made here today to eliminate this $12 million; he rather ridiculed it as an infinitesimal part of the bill we are considering today—but I will tell the members of the Committee how important it is and why it is not insignificant. Once we give this contract authority to spend $12 million for rent subsidies, you have to multiply that by 40 because it runs for 40 years. So instead of talking about $12 million being invloved in this item, we should be talking about $480 million. And, Mr. Chairman, that is not all, because in the program envisioned in fiscal 1967, on which we had hearings just yesterday, the administration is asking for $35 million more. It will ask for $40 million, in the next year and for $45 million in the fourth year, at which time this program will be costing $150 million a year. Multiply that by 40, and you will find that we are talking about inaugurating a brandnew program here today, superimposed on the existing costly public housing program, of which there is not one word in the RECORD that will justify an assumption that it is going to be discontinued, which has a maximum price tag of $6 billion.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman from North Carolina arrives at the $480 million figure by multiplying 40 by $12 million, which we are proposing to supply in the supplemental bill.

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. BOLAND. But is it not entirely conceivable that a number of these people whose rents will be supplemented during this period could easily go off the program?

Mr. JONAS. Oh, yes; but I am quite sure they will be replaced by others.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as I understood the testimony before the committee, that figure could be reduced by a couple of hundred millions of dollars.

Mr. JONAS. The $6 billion is the maximum cost.

Mr. BOLAND. This is really the outside figure. It is conceivable that it would not reach this figure, though.

Mr. JONAS. That just depends on how popular this program is and how many people get into it. Something has been said here about changing the regulations or making them more practical. It is true that this has been done. Maximum limits have been placed on assets and income. But I would like the Committee to understand that whereas there is a limitation on the amount of rent that could be paid, it is tied to the cost of the unit. Now the maximum limit of rent for a three-bedroom apartment would be $140 a month, of which the Government would pay the difference between what the economic rent and 25 percent of the income of the family. But there is another provision which says that in high-cost areas of the country, the Administrator can increase these limits by 25 percent. So wherever you cannot build one of these housing units for $12,500—by whatever the amount it has to be increased to construct them—the $140 limit would be raised, and it could go to $175 a month.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not question that point. I was only saying that when you multiply the 40-year period by the $12 million that we are supplying in this supplemental appropriation, it would not necesarily mean $480 million because, again I say, a number of these people would be going off the program—just as quickly as their income would be sufficient to pay their entire rent, without any subsidy. These families would stay right in this supplemental rent housing and they would pay the total amount of rent that the nonprofit organization or the limited profit or cooperative housing corporation has set under the rent subsidy. So it is not necessarily so that we would be actually paying $480 million over the 40-year period because enough of them might reach that amount of income that would no longer qualify them for a rent subsidy.

Mr. JONAS. That is right. I agree with the gentleman that there is no binding commitment that this is going to cost $480 million. It will depend on many things, including the points that the gentleman made. But it cannot be denied that the costs could go to $480 million from this initial $12 million and to $6 billion maximum if we fund the 250,000 units as authorized and as contemplated in the administration's program.

I do not blame people for wanting better housing. I hope all the people in America who live in substandard housing will enjoy better housing. But I would say when you talk about a program applicable to the lowest income people, $175 a month rent is quite high.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am interested in the colloquy that is taking place between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from North Carolina. To me the indication is that the cost would increase if the administration has its way because already the administration has requested more money than the Congress has allocated.

But one thing that disturbs me is that here we are embarking upon this kind of program when the administration just last fall cut out 8,500 units of military housing for servicemen. Now if we are going to deny our servicemen and the record is clear as to the need for military housing—if we are cutting or deferring 8,500 units for military families and coming in instead with this kind of a program, I have serious question about the merits of the program. But even if I did not, I think at this time it certainly ought to be deferred in the light of our other commitments especially in the area of defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, this is serious business we have before the House today. It is serious business because included in this supplemental appropriation bill is an appropriation to make effective two pieces of legislation, the authorizing legislation which never should have been passed in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I am referring, of course, to the rent subsidy bill and to the Teachers' Corps bill, neither of which should have been passed and certainly the funding for which should not be in this piece of legislation.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I commend the Committee for cutting the President's request from $30 to $12 million for the rent subidy and the Teachers' Corps from $13.2 to $10 million, but let me point out that this is still a foot in the door. It is a breach in the dike and will soon let the flood waters wash out the entire dike.

How can this Nation embark on a multibillion dollar program of paying house rent for what soon will be a sizable portion of the American population?

How can we embark on this Teachers' Corps program, a program which will make the Education Department in Washington a virtual czar over every school district in the Nation?

It is true these authorizations were passed last year, but unless they are funded by this supplemental, or the regular appropriation bill, they will not go into effect.

These two provisions must be stricken from this bill. There is in this bill much needed money, but if these two funds are left in the bill, the bill itself should be killed.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, the remarks I am about to make refer to a study of the 1967 budget prepared in cooperation with former Director of the Bureau of the Budget Maurice Stans. Mr. Stans is a recognized authority on Federal fiscal matters. I doubt if there is anyone inside or outside of Government who is more knowledgeable in this field than Mr. Stans.

DIMENSIONS

President Johnson's 1967 budget calls for expenditures of $112.8 billion and revenues of $111 billion, leaving a deficit of $1.8 billion. The message accompanying the budget states that the expenditure level is designed to support the struggle in Vietnam and also continue unabated the advance toward a Great Society at home.

The last time the Federal budget was balanced was in 1960, under President Eisenhower. Expenditures in that year were $76.5 billion and revenues were $77.7 billion. Since then the anuual deficits have totaled $36.4 billion, including the one proposed for 1967. The overall cost of running the Government has increased 47.5 percent in just 7 years.

MAJOR CHANGES

The President's budget message claims that outside of Vietnam, budget expenditures will rise by only $0.6 billion, or about half of 1 percent. It is interesting to see how this figure was reached, according to Budget Bureau Director Schultze:

	Billions
Increases:	
Great Society programs	$3.2
Interest costs	.8
Government pay increases	.3
Workload increases and contractual commitments	1.0
Total	5.3
Decreases:	
Increased sales of assets	1.6
Defense costs other than Vietnam	1.6
All other reductions	1.5
Total	4.7
Net increase	.6

The "other" decreases totaling $1.5 billion are in the space program, the postal service, agriculture, education—student loans, aid to federally affected schools—and smaller items.

Interpreted differently, it could be said that, apart from Defense, budget expenditures will increase $5.3 billion; and these are financed in part by increasing the sales of assets by $1.6 billion and by budget reductions of $1.5 billion, leaving a net increase, apart from Defense, of $2.2 billion. However, as is shown later, many of the so-called reductions are suspect and some of the increases appear to be understated, with the result that the net increase in nondefense programs will very likely turn out to be much higher than $2.2 billion by the end of the budget year.

UNUSUAL FEATURES

Many elements of the press have criticized the 1967 budget as being full of "gimmickry," in terms that reflect on its integrity.

Detailed analysis of the elements of revenue and expenditure comprised within the current budget discloses many unusual items that, taken together, cast doubt upon the inference of a nearly balanced financial program. In particular:

First. There are many expenditure estimates that appear to be unduly low, considering the character and momentum of the programs involved. Included in these are interest costs on the national debt, payments under the Alliance for Progress and for foreign development loans, and the costs of ship construction, the postal service, veterans pensions, and many other items.

Example: Interest costs on the Federal debt are based on rates in effect at the beginning of calendar 1966; they have already advanced substantially above that level.

Second. There are a number of items in the budget in which revenue increases or expense reductions depend upon new legislation, much of which the Congress has refused to pass in prior years. They include the proposed assessment of fees for meat and poultry inspection, the transfer of forest highway and public lands highway costs to the highway trust fund and other similar proposals.

Example: Fees for meat and poultry inspection would total $66.2 million, which is applied to reduce expenses of the Consumer and Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture; the Congress has refused on at least five occasions to enact such fees.

Third. There are a number of one-time savings in expenditures through changes in disbursing procedures or methods of accounting. These include the public assistance funds, highway beautification, surplus agricultural products, and other items.

Example: Public assistance expenditures are reduced approximately $150 million by rescheduling the dates of payment; this is obviously a nonrecurring "saving."

Fourth. There are reductions in levels of certain going programs which the Congress is not likely to accept. These include the school milk and school lunch programs, agricultural research, payments to federally affected school districts and to land-grant colleges and others.

Example: The school milk program is reduced from $89 million to $37 million by making the milk available only to needy children; it is doubtful that the Congress will permit this distinction.

Fifth. Expenditure totals are reduced by expected credits of $4.7 billion for sales of Government-owned loans and mortgages, and other similar credits of smaller amount.

Example: Loans and mortgages totaling $4.2 billion which are not salable as such will be pooled into units of participation and sold; the Government will subsidize the interest rates to permit their sale to investors in the market.

Sixth. There are other proposals that tend to reduce both revenues and expenditures in equal amounts, but which the Congress has refused to accept in prior years. These involve revolving funds for rural electrification and for power marketing agencies.

Example: The proposed revolving fund for REA would decrease Federal revenues in 1967 by $196 million and expenditures by the same amount; this tends to hold down the spending level but does not change the deficit.

In many cases both spending authority and estimated outgo of funds have been held to very close figures. The budgets of some of the departments and agencies are very tight, considering the responsibilities they carry.

Except for its lavishness in about 20 different Great Society programs, the entire budget document has the tightly corseted appearance of a design to make the total costs of Government seem to be less than they are. The most notable examples of this strain are in the forecast that appropriations for disaster costs will reduce from $130 million in 1966 to $15 million in 1967, and the needs for farm conservation emergencies will subside from $24 million in 1966 to only $5 million in 1967. It seems doubtful that the administration can exert such effective control over the forces of nature.

The following is a rough table of these elements:

	Millions
Probable underestimate of expenditures in authorized programs and in interest	$800
Reductions that depend on new legislation, much of which the Congress has refused in previous years	200
Nonrecurring savings through changes in accounting or procedures	400
Budget cuts which the Congress is not likely to accept	200
Sales of loans and other assets	4,900
Proposals for revolving funds	(1)
Total	6,500

[1] No net effect on the deficit.

Even assuming that some portion of the heavy sales of assets can be considered normal, it is evident that expenditures in total are abnormally low by as much as $4 to $5 billion, as a result of all the foregoing.

ILLUSTRATION

The budget of the Department of Agriculture is a good illustration of how such items are used. Its expenditures are shown to decrease by $1,090 million in 1967 from 1966. Here are the major items making up that decrease:

	Millions
Proposal to convert REA into a revolving fund so that it can use its own receipts out of Government revenues instead of asking for appropriations	($196.0)
Proposal to charge fees for meat and chicken inspection, which Congress has regularly refused to do	66.2
Reduction in school milk and school lunch programs, which the Congress is unlikely to accept	70.0
Reduction in cost of removing surplus agricultural commodities, a permanent appropriation, which is used instead to finance the food stamp program by a bookkeeping transfer	135.2
Reduction in cost of Commodity Credit Corporation farm price supports and foreign aid food programs	387.0
Sales of participations in farmers home loans	549.0
Increased sales of loans from Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	104.7
Smaller items—actual net savings	12.4
Total	1,325.5
Less increases in cropland adjustment program, net	191.5
Food stamp program	43.9
	235.4
Reduction per budget	1,090.1

Thus, the actual economies which are reflected in this reduction amount to a net figure of only $12.4 million.

The indicated "saving" of $387.0 million in the costs of the farm price sup-

port programs of Commodity Credit Corporation is a highly questionable one, despite indications of improvements in farm conditions. In the last 6 fiscal years, the actual expenditures of the Department of Agriculture have averaged about $800 million a year above the budget estimates, mostly because of underestimating in the costs of these farm programs.

REVENUES

On the revenue sidc, the budget contains many nonrecurring items which will not prevail in future years, at least not to the same extent. The nonrecurring corporate and individual tax collections are $3.6 billion; the seigniorage on coins is about $1.3 billion higher than normal because of the large amount of silver coins being replaced; the sales of commodities from stockpile are probably $600 million higher than normal; rents and royalties on the Outer Continental Shelf are apparently abnormal by more than $200 million; and there are other unusual items. Altogether, the total of abnormal, nonrecurring, and doubtful budget receipts is about $6 billion.

GENERAL FINDINGS

On the whole, these facts lead to the conclusions that: (a) The budget is misleading in its implications of a fiscal program that is in near-balance and which is a step toward a balanced budget soon in the future; (b) The budget, with its continued expansionary thrust, is the wrong plan for the present time because the deficit will prove to be larger than indicated and the result will be inflationary.

More specifically, a careful reading of the details of the budget proposals produces these findings:

First. It is very probable that the deficit at the end of the year will be much higher than the $1.8 billion which the President expects. There are many factors that can and probably will get out of hand and it is likely that the actual red figure will be in excess of $5 billion. If the Vietnam war is ended, this may not be much different because the budget message indicates that in such case more funds will be applied to domestic programs.

Second. A squeeze in corporate profits, which some economists are predicting for 1966 and 1967, could increase the deficit much above that. Roughly, every 10 percent drop in pretax corporate profits will reduce tax payments and increase the deficit by about $3.5 billion. A significant drop in corporate profits could produce a very large deficit.

Third. The true deficit base of the 1967 budget, from which future budgets have to be built, is probably in excess of $12 billion. This amount is computed by eliminating the abnormal and nonrecurring amounts in revenues and expenditures. This being the case, a balanced budget is a long way off, even under highly favorable conditions.

Fourth. The future is affected also by the buildup in spending authority. The proposed appropriations for 1966 and 1967 amount to $28.7 billion more than the actual net expenditures for those years, adding that much to future spending pressures. The unobligated balance at the beginning of fiscal 1967 will be $115 billion; adding the newly requested authority to this makes a total of $236 billion available for fiscal 1967. After expenditures and lapses, there will be $122 billion available for 1968 and later years. The Great Society programs are barely beginning and are sure to grow at a fast rate. And no one knows what our military needs will be in Vietnam or elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, it should be clearly evident to every reader of these remarks that we urgently need truth in budgeting from the Johnson administration.

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlemen from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I have read the minority views on this bill, and when the fine words in these views are stacked against the performance of the minority party, I think the political gimmickry becomes just about as transparent as cellophane.

The minority is zeroing in now on the rent supplement, which is $12 million. Of course, they opposed the program when the authorization was entered into, and it is to be expected that they would oppose the appropriation.

But, as the same time as they are complaining about this $12 million in the interest of economy, we hear scarcely a murmur about the fact that our committee has added an additional $41 million for federally impacted areas over that which the administration recommended through the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point on the question he just raised?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes, I will yield, but before I do I would like to acknowledge that the gentleman from Ohio has made a statement and has definitely gone on record as opposing this $41 million.

Mr. BOW. I wanted to say further to the gentleman that I will give everyone who is loyal to the administration an opportunity to go along with the administration and vote against the $41 million. I will offer an amendment to strike it.

Mr. JOELSON. I will predict that the majority of the minority will not follow the gentleman from Ohio when he offers that amendment.

Mr. BOW. I am rather inclined to agree with my friend the gentleman from New Jersey, for a change.

Mr. JOELSON. Of course, the reason is crystal clear. The reason is that there are over 300 Members of this House who have these impacted areas within their districts, and it seems that the desire for economy has a tendency to disintegrate under the hot winds of political reality.

We are soon going to have a public works bill here, and I am going to predict again that a majority of the minority are going to support that bill. They will rise above principle, becaue there are going to be some "goodies" in that for many of the districts of the Members of the House.

When I was first appointed to the Appropriations Committee I made an offer.

I offered my services to the minority, and I would like to renew that offer. I believe economy is like charity; it begins at home. Every Member knows his own congressional district the best. If you will just tell me what spending you want eliminated in your congressional district—perhaps you have a flood-control project that you want taken away or a defense contract that you want eliminated—please tell me. I will compile the list. I know it will be tedious and time-consuming, but I volunteer to do it, and I wil turn it over to the chairman.

The fact is that the Republican Members do not hesitate to add significantly to the administration's spending proposals. I have in mind the GI bill of rights legislation. I voted for that bill, and I think it is a good bill, but I think we should bear in mind that this will cost us $250 milion a year beyond the recommendations of the administration. I did not hear any crying from the minority side about the fact that we are spending this money. Again I am sure that this will not be the last time in this session of Congress that restraints recommended by the administration will be ignored and that we will spend beyond the recommendations of the administration.

We hear a lot about sacrificing because of Vietnam. I agree that we should sacrifice, but it seems to me cruel that we should ask the poor of this Nation to do all the sacrificing, because they can least afford it. When the minority talks about the Great Society programs, they are talking about programs to help poor people. I say that instead of attacking the programs that help the dispossessed and the disadvantaged, we should face up to our responsibilities.

We do have a problem about revenues. We do have the very present danger of inflation. I would say that, instead of asking the poor people to sacrifice, we had better consider something positive. I would like to suggest that we consider removing that 7-percent incentive on investments for tax purposes that we gave to the corporations of this country. It was placed in effect at a time when we were faced with some serious unemployment. We felt that it would stimulate employment. Now we are faced with the opposite situation. We have a manpower shortage. I think if we want to stop inflation and increase our revenues, we had better look very carefully at this unfair advantage that the corporations get at the expense of the individual taxpayer.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, while our subcommittee has cut the requested amount for implementation of the National Teacher Corps from $13.2 million to $10 million, and provided for 10 percent local contribution as against 100 percent Federal financing, and have also required that the State education offices

be brought into the picture, I am still opposed to the concept in principle. My earlier fears of the program have been more than borne out in the testimony given to our subcommittee in support of this request for money. As a matter of fact, the hearings on this proposition before our subcommittee are the only extensive ones in depth held in the House. The hearing record is a good one and every Member of this House ought to read it thoroughly and digest the contradictions and the confusion of the statements.

After hearing much of the testimony, I was moved to ask the Commissioner of Education what the real thrust of this program is supposed to be. I am sure that Members of Congress were given to understand that this program was designed to upgrade and enhance the educational opportunity of underprivileged kids, but the more testimony we listened to, the more it was quite apparent that much more attention was going to be given to providing master's and doctor's degrees for those who already have bachelor's degrees and to make them beholden to the Federal Government for the cost of upgrading their own education or professional standing.

The National Teachers Corps was conceived according to Francis Keppel, the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education, to bypass certification requirements imposed by the various States. You are well aware, of course, that throughout the country those desiring to go into the teaching profession have got to meet certain minimum standards, education hour requirements, and so forth. It is a good thing and we ought to strive to raise those standards.

Mr. Keppel as Commissioner of Education made a speech on February 13 before the annual meeting of Educational Writers Association in Atlantic City, in which he pointed out that many returning Peace Corps volunteers had not been able to obtain employment as teachers because of outmoded and artificial certification requirements imposed by the various States.

There are those, and I believe it was brought out in the discussion of this proposition in the other body, who are of the opinion that any young American who has "taught school under difficult circumstances in underprivileged parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America should at least be given a chance to teach school in the United States."

Well, now, is not this just ducky? Those of us who have traveled all round the face of the globe, throughout Africa and through those underdeveloped countries of southeast Asia, are aware that one can be qualified to be a teacher in those countries with a fifth-grade education. That is how bad the situation is. Now I do not mean to be downgrading our Peace Corps volunteers, for I supported this proposition from its very inception, but I believe it is completely erroneous to take the view that because volunteers have spent some time teaching the natives the domestic tricks of the trade in their locale that this in itself qualifies them to teach in American schools.

Under careful questioning the Commissioner of Education admitted that the prime objective of the National Teacher Corps would be to train prospective teachers—the "interns"—to work with disadvantaged students. Secretary Gardner, however, stated that the National Teacher Corps "was not designed as a program to assist teachers or the members of the Teacher Corps."

In the hearings the Assistant Secretary of the Department, Wilbur Cohen, denied that a means test or economic determination would be used to decide on a school district's application eligibility for participation in this program. On the other hand, the National Teacher Corps Preliminary Guidelines on page 41 state:

> In order to be eligible to participate in the program in the fiscal year 1966–67, the local education agency must have included * * * one or more schools with attendance areas in which at least half of the families were low-income families. Participating schools will therefore be asked to estimate the percentage of their students who come from families with an income of less than $3,000 per year.

The Comptroller of the Department testified that mothers who at one time had taught and whose families have grown up could become members of the Corps. This is true if they do not object to being interns. The guidelines prescribe that the experienced teachers or team leaders be expected to have had at least "5 years' recent," note that, "recent satisfactory experience in teaching."

Commissioner Howe indicated that it is possible to have a title I project under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Public Law 89–10—analogous to NTC. The Commissioner said that this type of program "would depend on having university resources available and developing cooperative arrangements with universities for awarding credit to these teachers while they are in training. These features are not usual features of an inservice training plan within a school district."

In a letter I submitted to the Office of Education I posed several questions that follow, with the answers that I received:

> Question. Is it possible for a group of school districts, if it wished, to allocate major portions of its title I funds to set up a teacher training arrangement analogous to the arrangement planned for the Teacher Corps?
>
> Answer. A group of individual local school districts entitled to financial assistance under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, may elect to have a combined program in cooperation with an institution of higher education that would involve the training of teachers for specific assignments under a title I program to provide for the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. Such a combined project, however, must meet with the approval of the State educational agency.
>
> Question. Is it possible for a group of school districts to submit an acceptable proposal for title III funds to set up a teacher training arrangement analogous to the arrangement planned for the Teacher Corps?
>
> Answer. Under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a proposal may also be submitted by a group of school districts for teacher training as an exemplary model for regular school programs. Under the title, the Office of Education is obligated to consult with the State educational agency but final approval rests with the Commissioner of Education.
>
> Question. Have any such proposals under title I or title III been submitted?
>
> Answer. Proposals have been made under both title I and title III for teacher training but in all cases have been limited to the geographical area to be covered by the proposal. In the title III projects, teacher training has been part of a larger program, such as curriculum improvement.
>
> Question. You cited "mobility" as a key feature that distinguishes the Teacher Corps from a title I or III proposal. Could you again state an example as you did on the phone of what you mean by "mobility"?
>
> Answer. The mobility factor involved in the National Teacher Corps that does not have a corollary under titles I and III involves the stimulative effect of a nationwide recruitment and selection effort. The reason for this mobility is the fact that those individuals who may wish to join the National Teacher Corps would reside in areas where little need exists, and conversely, those school districts most in need of teachers would have little supply available. It would be our objective to have Teacher Corps members assigned to university training programs in the same locality as the school districts requesting their teaching services. The fiscal year 1966 budget estimate includes an amount of $1,875,000 to pay for the travel costs involved.

If, as the Commissioner and the Office of Education would have us believe, the local school district, the State education agency and the university cannot involve themselves in a program of inservice training without Federal level help, why do the National Teacher Corps guidelines on page 25 state:

> It is expected that the universities will develop their proposals in cooperation with local school systems * * *. Similarly, the local education agencies should prepare their proposals in cooperation with a university or universities which would be capable of conducting the preservice training.

I think that it should be pointed out that presently about $50 million is being used on inservice training of teachers under title I of 89–10, five times what is being sought here.

In addition to this the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorizes the award of 10,000 fellowships for graduate study to persons interested in a career in elementary and secondary education; in another section—title IV–B—it authorizes 100 percent loan forgiveness for student borrowers who subsequently teach in schools having large numbers of disadvantaged children. This is to say nothing of National Defense Education Act institutes for teachers who are going to work with disadvantaged pupils.

All of these programs exhibit a wild confusion of purpose in Federal programs which overlap, duplicate, and compete. The only thing that is truly different about the National Teacher Corps is that it will permit "interns" by Federal edict to enter the local school district without certification that would be normally required of beginning teachers. This program will not only overlap, duplicate, and compete—it will cause friction and conflict in the schools that can least afford it.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman is not opposing the two provisos which were inserted in this bill, and the amendments which I offered in the committee—the first providing for local matching by the local school districts of whatever State up to at least 10 percent of the cost of a teacher under the Teacher Corps program.

Mr. MICHEL. No, I am not opposing that because this is, as I said I believe at the outset of my remarks, a definite improvement.

Mr. LAIRD. The second proviso which was added and this I feel is needed, provides teachers will be assigned, the Teacher Corps personnel, by the chief State school officer in each of the 50 States. As the legislation originally passed, the Commissioner of Education could deal directly with 10,000 school districts in the Nation. It seems to me the Commissioner of Education should be limited in dealing only with the top school administrators in each of the 50 States. This proviso which was offered in the subcommittee and adopted by the full committee is now in this bill and I think these limitations do strengthen the original legislation.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is altogether correct. As he knows I wholeheartedly supported his meritorious motions in committee.

Secretary Gardner told the committee that the National Teacher Corps interns would work full time for their salaries, but the Guidelines provide that "interns are expected to spend approximately half time in graduate study leading to an advanced degree." How many regular school district teachers, who are just beginning at the rate of a beginning National Teacher Corps intern salary level, will not consider this a gross injustice?—especially when they consider the fact that the intern comes with only a preservice training that Mr. Howe, himself, describes as "quickie" training. He went so far as to admit that educationally deprived pupils in low-income neighborhoods would be used as "guinea pigs" by National Teacher Corps. This would be done while the intern was pursuing a master's degree in such an item as guidance counseling as permitted by the Guidelines.

What would be the cost of one of these National Teacher Corps interns? A breakdown follows for a full 2-year program:

Preservice training—10-week institute:	
Stipends ($112 per week, p. 72, hearings)	$1,120
Instruction ($91 per week)	910
2-week orientation to the community of assignment:	
Briefing sessions for exchange teachers ($50 per week)	100
Travel	100
Total	2,230
Inservice training:	
Master's degree ($2,500 per year, p. 53, Guidelines)	5,000
Maximum beginning salary of the local school ($5,000 per year, p. 8639, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)	10,000
Total	15,000
Change of residence: Average allowance (p. 72, hearings)	$500
2-year total cost	17,730

The average intern benefit a year as permitted by the National Teacher Corps will be over $8,800. That is not bad for a "quickie" trained part-time teacher of "guinea pigs."

This bill does not include the funding for teacher salaries that will be required to finance this program.

In conclusion, for those who would cite section 516 as proof of the lack of Federal control in this bill I would like to refer you to the following statements found in the guidelines:

The team leaders' * * * secondary duty will be to provide a liaison between the local school administration, the university, and the teacher-intern group to assure adherence to program goals (p. 16).

The individual teachers * * * may provide guidance in the development of specialized curriculum for students, or engage in classroom demonstrations of effective teaching methods and procedures (p. 16).

The local education agency must afford teacher-interns time, aside from teaching duties, for a training program developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner of Education and carried out under the guidance of the experienced teacher (who is team leader) in cooperation with an institution of higher education (p. 19).

Selection of NTC members will be the responsibility of the NTC alone (p. 30).

The contradictions, the conflicts, the confusion and the chaos of this program would be better forgotten. The many other programs that are available for in-service training should be more fully explored and used.

More than anything else in education today, we need a consistent, orderly Federal policy directed at strengthening State and local school systems, reaffirming the independence and integrity of our education structure, and helping to solve the basic problems which stand in the way of achieving equal opportunity for a higher quality education. This so-called Teacher Corps would not only hamper that effort considerably, but would leave our teachers tied to Uncle Sam's purse strings and subject to his control.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

HIGH INTEREST RATES DETRIMENTAL TO NATIONAL SECURITY AND GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the main controversy about this bill is the rent supplement program. I look upon the rent supplement program as one of the most meritorious provisions in this bill. It will help poor people help themselves.

Mr. BARRATT O'HARA our esteemed colleague from Illinois one time gave a good illustration. Coming from Chicago he said that back in times gone by, oftentimes an aged person would not have enough money to sustain himself in living quarters, and there was not room in the poorhouse. At that time we had real poorhouses.

Back in those days, the neighbors would collect money among themselves to provide aged people with sufficient money so that they would have a place to live.

That is really what this supplemental rent program does. It helps people who cannot help themselves.

The rent supplement program is a basic part of the Johnson administration's effort to make decent housing a reality for all Americans. It is an imaginative new tool which provides a steppingstone between public housing and privately financed housing.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS HELP RELIEVE PRESSURE ON PUBLIC HOUSING

Rent supplements will do much to relieve the heavy demand for public housing units. When we considered the 1965 Housing Act last summer, there were more than 500,000 persons waiting in line for public housing. Rent supplements will help relieve this demand.

The rent supplement program brings the American free enterprise system into full play in meeting the housing needs of low- and moderate-income Americans. It helps provide for the needs of these income groups and, at the same time, gives a substantial boost to the private building industry.

Many of those who oppose the rent supplement program are the same ones who have fought against public housing. So when the administration moved to relieve the pressure on public housing through the new rent supplements program, its critics shifted their attack. The opponents of rent supplements are from the same group that forms the basic hard-core opposition to all Federal housing programs. They are the same people who oppose FHA, VA college housing, and all of the rest of the programs.

Mr. Chairman, in recent days, our Republican colleagues have expressed great concern about prices, wages, and what they like to describe as inflation. They now attack all programs in the name of inflation.

Now to set the record straight, it should be noted that both the Republican and the Democratic Parties are opposed to inflation. Neither party has a monopoly on protecting the public interest in this area.

DEMOCRATS DON'T FEAR PROSPERITY

At the same time, I do not believe that the great majority of the Democratic members of this body share the trembling and fearful approach to prosperity as evidenced by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Frankly, I feel that this country is big enough and strong enough to withstand the great benefits of prosperity without falling into the trap of inflation.

However, I am sure that my distinguished Republican friends are quite serious in their concern over prices. These same men, however, while seeking to deprive the poor of this country from having adequate housing, press down upon them the thorns of high interest rates.

Interest rates are something that we all have to pay. The cost of money is reflected in every item in the economy from a simple pair of work shoes to a super deluxe Cadillac. It is reflected in the Federal budget and in every local and State budget.

Interest rates now take $13 billion annually out of the national budget. Interest rates are the biggest single item in the cost of a house—more than the lumber, the land, the workmanship combined.

So I ask my Republican friends who have expressed such concern about prices to join me in this crusade to keep interest rates down. Frankly, I was surprised that so many of the leading Republican members rose to defend the Federal Reserve Board when it raised interest rates by 37½ percent last December. Certainly that December interest rate increase has done more than anything else to put heavy upward pressure on the price of every item in the economy. If the Republican Party is indeed serious about holding down prices, then I submit that it must be equally serious about holding down interest rates.

However, I am fearful that the silly-season is upon us and our Republican friends, predictably, are up to their old tricks of opposing good works designed to help the American people. Naturally, this latest partisan GOP stunt is not funny to people living in crime- and vice-ridden slums in Los Angeles or to poverty-ridden children in Appalachia whose parents are so poor that they cannot even afford to pay teachers for the one-room, fire-trap shacks they call school buildings.

Not satisfied with massive corporate tax rate cuts, high bracket personal income tax cuts, accelerated corporate depreciation schedules and the 7-percent tax credit on new facilities, our Republican colleagues are now singing the same old refrain from their favorite theme: Everything for big business—they can do no wrong—and what is left over can trickle down to the ordinary citizen. Big business does not want public programs, Mr. Speaker, because for every tax dollar the Government spends on people there is that much less for dividends to stockholders. But what better investment can ever be made than a sound investment in the future of our own people? It is a firmly established principle of economics that improvement at the grassroots level creates purchasing power which is made and is spent over and over again—percolating up and throughout the entire economy to the benefit of all—rich and poor alike. But our GOP friends seem firmly dedicated to the "trickle-down" theory which has been repeatedly discredited at the polls. It will happen again in this congressional election year of 1966 just as in 1964. These people, the Republicans, seem fiercely determined to remain a permanent minority party. The way they are going now they may well succeed. What their programs are and how they expect to benefit the citizens of this great land I am unable to divine. In any case, there can be no doubt that our traditional two-party system faces extinction, and it is certainly not the Democrats who deserve the label of the antipeople party.

GUNS VERSUS BUTTER IS PHONY ISSUE

But that is exactly what the GOP is when it raises the phony issue of "guns versus butter." They claim that because of $13.1 billion for Vietnam, we cannot afford to take care of those now in slums who would be rescued by a modest rent supplement request. They downgrade our economic ability when they carp that we cannot extend a pittance of help to underprivileged children barely subsisting in our worst poverty-stricken areas. They are trying to mislead the American electorate—I say electorate because it is nothing but a cheap political trick they are trying to pull here. They hate for anyone else to benefit from public policies except big business. So they try to frighten the people into thinking that these public programs will bankrupt us. But they do not have the facts—these Republicans—and if they do have them, they hide or distort them. They would cheat the needy by deliberate misrepresentations, by downgrading our record-shattering prosperity.

In 1960, Federal Government purchases of goods and services amounted to 10.6 percent of gross national product; in 1965, Federal Government purchases of goods and services amounted to only 9.8 percent of gross national product. At the end of fiscal 1961, the total public debt amounted to 56.8 percent of gross national product; but at the end of fiscal 1965, the total public debt amounted to only 47 percent of gross national product. The source of these figures is the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and all necessary adjustments have been made.

These figures prove beyond a doubt that the "guns or butter" issue is a phony one. We are in a much better financial position now than we were under the last Republican administration. We can afford to protect American interests in resisting the spread of communism abroad and take care of necessary domestic problems at the same time. Even making adjustments for possible price increases and a Vietnam deficit, our total public debt as a percentage of gross national product will fall further to about 45 percent.

It is true that the December 6, 1965, action of the Federal Reserve—taken in defiance of the President and the Congress—is putting a severe strain on housing developments in all parts of the country. Already, there is talk of interest rates of more than 7 percent on home mortgages. And with the supply tightening, money, even at that extortionate rate, will be unavailable.

Unless something is done to halt these rising interest costs, we may be heading for a long period of stagnation in our efforts to provide decent housing and adequate public facilities. In recent days, the financial pages of the newspapers have reported decisions by dozens of local and State governments to postpone bond issues because of the rising cost of money. That means that sewerage plants, water plants, parks, and schools will not be built.

Even one of the members of the Federal Reserve has been very candid about the effect of the interest rate increases on the housing programs. Federal Reserve Governor Sherman Maisel, in a speech shortly after the December 6 increase, said that residential construction drops as much as 24 percent in a period of tight money. That was back in December, and today interest rates have gone even higher and money is becoming in shorter and shorter supply.

But, even accepting Governor Maisel's figures at face value, I do not believe the country can afford a 24-percent drop in housing construction. I do not believe we can afford a 24-percent cutback in providing parks, sewerage and a multitude of other necessary public facilities.

FEDERAL RESERVE ADDS $750 MILLION TO BUDGET

The higher interest rates have put a new strain on the Federal budget—thus limiting the funds available for new housing programs. That December 6 interest increase forced President Johnson to add $750 million to the fiscal 1967 budget just to pay the additional interest costs on the national debt. If we had not had that December 6 increase, the $750 million could have been applied to housing or some other badly needed program. Instead, that sum will go to the banks. So while people do without housing, we will have a Federal aid program for bankers—courtesy of the Federal Reserve Board.

The $750 million added to the interest charges brings the total annual interest cost of the public debt to $12.750 billion for the next fiscal year.

In 1952, in the last year of the Truman administration, the interest charges on the national debt stood at $5.859 billion. This means that the Federal Reserve has added $6.898 billion to the annual cost of financing the public debt.

It is tragic when you realize that the American people have been forced to pay almost $60 billion in excess interest costs because of rising interest rates since 1952. This amounts to almost 10 percent of the gross national product and more than half of the estimated Federal budget for fiscal 1967.

We could have done wonderful things in housing, urban development, and rural development if this money could have been channeled into something more productive than paying the bankers increased interest.

All of this plainly points up the fact that high interest rates are a cruel and unfair tax on the poor, on the low-income and the moderate-income family—the people least able to pay. It is not, as the Federal Reserve Board would have us believe, a means of curbing inflation.

HIGH INTEREST RATES ADD TO COST OF ALL PRODUCTS

In fact, rising interest rates add to the cost of nearly every item in our economy. So, to the extent that higher interest rates increase prices, they are inflationary. Monetary policy is a highly ineffective tool in fighting inflation. There are many other more meaningful tools at hand, including taxes, particularly taxes on excess profits during a wartime period.

But, the Federal Reserve uses inflation as an excuse for its actions. It does not tell the public the true facts about the reasons behind these constantly skyrocketing interest rates. The fact is,

of course, that higher interest rates are a means of providing the financial institutions with higher profits. Most interest rate increases over the past decade can be traced simply to the desire of the larger banks for increased profits.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE DOES NOT REPRESENT THE PEOPLE

The Federal Reserve System has gotten outside the Government. The spiral of higher interest rates imposed by the Federal Reserve has greatly increased the national debt.

The people who are running our Nation's monetary affairs are not elected by the people. There is no way to punish them. The Federal Reserve makes one mistake after another, in an effort to help the big bankers, but who can do anything about it?

They are beyond us. They cannot be punished. If it were left up to the Members of the Congress, elected by the people, and to the President of the United States, elected by the people, the people could hold us responsible. We could be punished for this action. But the unelected people who have charge of our money system and our credit system cannot be punished.

Who has charge of our money system? Unfortunately, the people who can profit most by high interest. It has been to their advantage over the years to keep raising interest higher and higher and higher.

The banks have gotten control of the monetary and credit privileges and rights which should belong only to the American people. The banks have usurped with these privileges and powers.

THE BURDEN OF INTEREST RATES

The success of the President's Great Society programs are hindered and handicapped by two major problems. One is the Vietnam war, which is costing us about $13 billion this year. The other is that the Federal Reserve System which has and continues to defy the President. This defiance is costing the people several times $13 billion this year—several times $13 billion.

Yields on long-term Government bonds, by months, 1939–52

[Percent per annum]

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Year
1939	2.47	2.44	2.34	2.30	2.17	2.13	2.16	2.21	2.65	2.60	2.46	2.35	2.36
1940	2.30	2.32	2.25	2.25	2.38	2.39	2.28	2.25	2.18	2.10	1.97	1.89	2.21
1941	1.99	2.10	2.01	1.96	1.92	1.91	1.90	1.94	1.94	1.88	1.85	1.96	1.95
1942	2.48	2.48	2.46	2.44	2.45	2.43	2.46	2.47	2.46	2.45	2.47	2.49	2.46
1943	2.46	2.46	2.48	2.48	2.46	2.45	2.45	2.46	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.49	2.47
1944	2.49	2.49	2.48	2.48	2.49	2.49	2.49	2.48	2.47	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.48
1945	2.44	2.38	2.40	2.39	2.39	2.35	2.34	2.36	2.37	2.35	2.33	2.33	2.37
1946	2.21	2.12	2.09	2.08	2.19	2.16	2.18	2.23	2.28	2.26	2.25	2.24	2.19
1947	2.21	2.21	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.22	2.25	2.24	2.24	2.27	2.36	2.39	2.25
1948	2.45	2.45	2.44	2.44	2.42	2.41	2.44	2.45	2.45	2.45	2.44	2.44	2.44
1949	2.42	2.39	2.38	2.38	2.38	2.38	2.27	2.24	2.22	2.22	2.20	2.19	2.31
1950	2.20	2.24	2.27	2.30	2.31	2.33	2.34	2.33	2.36	2.38	2.38	2.39	2.32
1951	2.39	2.40	2.47	2.56	2.63	2.65	2.63	2.57	2.56	2.61	2.66	2.70	2.57
1952	2.74	2.71	2.70	2.65	2.57	2.61	2.61	2.70	2.71	2.74	2.71	2.75	2.68

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "Banking and Monetary Statistics," 1953; Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1958; and Treasury Bulletins.

Our burden of interest today, my friends, is much higher than you think. It is almost as high as our entire national budget. So the people of this country not only pay over $100 billion in our national budget, but also they are paying $100 billion in interest for all purposes, including our national debt.

That is burdensome. It is more than that. It is imoral and unconscionable.

Go back to World War II. We had 12 years there when the Federal Reserve Board worked in the public interest. Mr. Roosevelt was President of the United States. He insisted on a fair rate of interest. He tried to get Congress to pay more of the cost of the war out of taxes as the war progressed, but we refused to do it as Members of Congress. He wanted us to pay 50 percent of the cost of the war as we went along, but the Congress provided only 25 percent.

Then Mr. Roosevelt said, "If we have to finance so much of the war without taxes and through the issuance of public debt, we will keep the interest rates low." We had cooperation of the Federal Reserve Board from June 30, 1939, to June 30, 1951, for 12 years. They were the hardest, roughest years in the history of any civilized country. We had many millions of unemployed. We had long breadlines. People actually starved during that time, and families suffered.

INTEREST RATES KEPT LOW DURING WORLD WAR II

We had inflation, we had a war, and we were shooting away a quarter billion dollars a day on the battlefield. Yet despite these hardships and the financial strains they brought notwithstanding that terrific period of 12 years, the money rates on long-term bonds never exceeded 2½ percent.

Did you know that not one person was ever required to sell his bond below par? Not one. So bonds were kept at par, and the interest rate never exceeded 2½ percent.

The question is, If you can maintain that 2½-percent rate in such a hard time as that, over a 12-year period, why can you not do it at any time?

You can, with the help of the Federal Reserve Board. If the Federal Reserve Board will help, you can do it. If the Federal Reserve Board will not help, interest rates will go skyrocketing. For instance today, Government-guaranteed obligations are being sold for 5.75 percent. It is a shame and a disgrace in a civilized country that we permit things like that to go on. It is absolutely shameful.

FEDERAL RESERVE SEIZED "INDEPENDENCE"

But this is happening right here today in broad daylight because the Federal Reserve has declared and seized independence. They have seceded from the Government. They are thumbing their nose at the Congress. They are thumbing their nose at the President of the United States and are defying him. Until we get them back in the Government we are in for a very hard time—the people are in for a very hard time.

Now, where is all of this money going? If you pay out $1 billion a year—and, of course, only $12 million is provided in this bill for rent supplements, which goes to poor people in the low-income groups who spend it quickly and put it into the channels of trade and distribution—it travels around in the community where it is spent. Statistics show that from 8 to 12 to 15 times different people touch it. It begins to percolate up. The big rich get ahold of it, too. They are entitled to the use of it just like the very poor. Funds in the hands of the poor are spent and percolate up to the top—through the economy.

However, if you pay in the money at the top expecting it to trickle down, it just does not trickle down. It goes to the first big bank and goes into their vault. It goes to a big corporation and it goes into the assets of that corporation, and that is the end of it. But if you pay the money to the low-income and they spend it, then by the time that dollar has traveled through many people and transactions in the course of a year, as the figures disclose it will, then the Government can actually get its money back and more by the time the year has expired. This point was recently proven by the excise tax reduction. We reduced our excise taxes considerably. That meant the poor people were permitted to hold that money and not pay it in in taxes but spend it for things they needed in the local communities. That money was spent. In the course of a year it traveled among 50 to 75 people. As a result Federal tax revenues, even after the reduction in excise taxes increased.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Chairman, I am not charging that the members of the Federal Reserve Board or the Chairman, Mr. Martin, are unpatriotic or un-American, but I do say that the Board in its handling of monetary and credit policies is making it very difficult for patriotic people to defend their country in time of war.

The high interest policies of the Federal Reserve System are very profitable to the big banks and money lenders generally but these policies are making it awfully hard on the people.

There are a few points that the Members of Congress should seriously consider at this time:

First. The Federal Reserve System has seized power to control monetary and credit policies of the Government including the power to increase interest rates and to make money tight. These powers have been used against the public interest.

Second. It was never intended that the Federal Reserve be the fourth branch of the Government or apart from the executive or legislative branch. It is a part of the executive branch of Govment. There is not anything in the law or discussions of the bills in Con-

gress in either House, before the enactment of the Federal Reserve laws or amendments thereto, that indicates in any way that it was the intention of Congress to make the Federal Reserve System independent. That claim is a fake—pure and simple. There is not one word of truth in it. It is used by Wall Street interests to feather their own nests and the fact that it makes it very hard on the people does not seem to deter them.

Third. The Federal Reserve has taken $40 billion of U.S. Government money and credit and bought $40 billion worth of U.S. Government interest-bearing bonds and is holding these bonds in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. These bonds have been paid for once; no one questions that. However, the Federal Reserve is still requiring the Treasury to take the taxpayers' money to the extent of a billion and a half dollars a year to pay interest on these bonds which have been paid for once. The Fed, after spending all of this billion and a half that the Federal Reserve banks want to spend along with the Federal Reserve Board and the remainder goes over into the Treasury. The Fed is willing therefore to have the people pay interest on bonds that have already been paid for once in order to get funds that will keep them from having to go to Congress to get appropriated funds for their operations like other government agencies compelled to do by law. In this way, the Federal Reserve is evading the Constitution of the United States. They are determined not to go to Congress like other Government agencies.

Having money of their own obtained in this sordid way, they can claim to be independent of Congress and go their own way. That is what led up to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Martin, actually going upon the President's own property in Texas and insulting him and the people of the Nation by defying the power given to the President under the elective processes of a democratic government.

Fourth. Not only has the Federal Reserve manipulated the Government's affairs in a way that the Fed is not compelled to permit Congress to know about its operations, but it is not audited by the General Accounting Office of the United States, as are other Government agencies. In fact, the Congress does not know what the Federal Reserve is doing; it has not been audited by the General Accounting Office since it was organized in 1913 yet, they are handling hundreds of billions of dollars of the people's money.

Fifth. The Federal Reserve operating in secret. Every 3 weeks the big bankers of the Nation, along with the Federal Reserve Board—12 bankers to 7 members of the Board—meet in secret session here in Washington. There are 30 or 40 staff people who meet with them. They make decisions that would enable people who have the information to make millions—even billions—of dollars. They claim this information does not leak out; however, the 12 bankers that know everything that is going on and are a part of it who were elected by the boards of directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks naturally report back to their banks and directors—6 of the board of directors of each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks composed of 9 members—are elected by the private banks in each of the 12 banks. No doubt there are some 500 people who know what is going on in secret but the President does not know, and Members of Congress do not know. No elected representative of the people is allowed to have the information until it is several years old. Yet, this is happening right here in broad daylight and tolerated by the Congress of the United States. Congress is not doing its duty; Congress is failing to do its duty. Congress is not protecting the people properly in this respect. Congress is allowing a few people to accumulate the wealth of the Nation to the detriment of the people.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this rent supplement appropriation.

The fact that the amount of the appropriation has been cut from $30 to $12 million makes no difference. It is still a multibillion-dollar scheme.

All the administration wants this year is some level of appropriation to get the program moving and once it starts moving, believe me, it will be unstoppable.

The amount of the appropriation is unimportant. It is the idea—the program—that is dangerous to our American way of life. A vote for this program will put a foot in the door for residential socialism.

A vote for $12 million here today is a vote to fund an insidious $6 billion scheme for the economic integration of the United States.

A vote to put this $6 billion Trojan horse on the road is a vote to undermine and destroy the incentives of Americans to better themselves by their own efforts—a traditionally American economic philosophy.

A vote for $12 million here today is a vote endorsing the full program in all its meanings.

The rent supplement program is a fraud. In the first place, the program is not aimed at providing the maximum number of low-cost housing units. The administration is not interested in housing per se. It is interested in using housing as a tool for economic integration.

The proponents of this scheme are interested in destroying neighborhoods and tampering with residential makeup of political districts.

If this administration is really interested in providing the maximum number of low-cost housing units—if it really cares about housing needs and not economic integration—it would be building more public housing. It would be improving public housing—making it more imaginative and humanizing it as it has been done in Europe.

No one questions the fact that rent supplements are a much more expensive way of housing the same family than public housing. The Government pays a premium to achieve economic integration.

When Mr. Ira Robbins, president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, testified before our Subcommittee on Housing, he told us that the average subsidy for a $4,000 a year family under the rent supplement program would be $66 per unit per month. But, in public housing, he said, the cost would be $37 per unit per month.

Mind you, twice as many families would be housed for the same cost if the administration dropped its plans for economic integration and concentrated on pure and simple housing for the poor.

The administration is out to grab middle-income taxes and use them to subsidize tenants in the same apartments that middle-income people are scrimping and saving to afford. All of this will be done in the name of economic integration. The poor families that could have been given public housing will be sacrificed. This is exactly what you will be voting for if you approve this appropriation.

Economic integration is unfair, its unjust and its uneconomic and the administration ought to have the courage to put its economic integration plans on the line instead of talking tripe about helping low-income people and their housing needs.

Let me make another point crystal clear. Only middle-income level housing can profitably be built under the rent supplement which means that tenants who are subsidized will be subsidized at greater expense of the taxpayers.

According to some experts, rent supplements would have to be boosted to several billion a year to do the economic integration job this administration wants.

A vote for $12 million today will be a vote for the biggest Trojan horse ever dragged before this Congress.

The proponents of this program say that the rent supplement program has been changed to make it workable. It has been changed alright—changed to get it through the Congress.

They will tell you that the program will not help anyone but low-income persons. There is nothing between the present regulations and complete revision but Secretary Weaver. These regulations can be changed at anytime. Besides, we are kidding ourselves if we think even today's regulations are any good.

Let me give some shortcomings in the present regulations.

First, there is no dollar limit as to the amount of rent subsidy any family can receive.

Secondly, there is no limit as to the percentage of any family's rent that can be paid by subsidy. It could be 25 percent. It could be 50 percent, and it could be more. Because unlike public housing, the rent supplement program does not aim at providing the maximum number of units at the lowest possible cost. The rent supplement has to be open ended—it has to be without dollar subsidy limitations—because it is utilizing uneconomic housing units.

If the program was aimed at providing the maximum number of low-cost

units, it would not have to be open-ended because there would be no question of extravagant subsidies. The open-ended subsidy provision in rent supplements is necessary to achieve economic integration.

There is another loophole in the regulations. The Secretary is the one who defines "income." Income is whatever he decides it is. It does not matter what income limits are set if the definition of what is income and what may be excluded in calculating it is left up to him. This unlimited power makes the income limit meaningless.

I do not see how anyone who looks at these regulations carefully can be misled into thinking they are safe. They are not. They are still a Pandora's box of tricks.

If the administration really wants to build the maximum number of housing units for poor people, it should build high rise public housing units in our crowded cities. But this is not the goal. The social planners have insisted on economic integration.

I think economic integration is unfair to most of the people affected. I do not see why middle-income people should suffer crushing tax burdens so that other people can live in similar apartments without paying the full rental. This type of thing has collectivist overtones.

I object for two reasons. First, because it is unfair to tax the typical hard-working middle-income taxpayer for this sort of luxury and secondly, because this type of program discriminates against the bulk of the low-income people needing housing.

As I said before, twice as many people could be housed if economic integration was not being given priority over housing needs.

The question before the House is plain: Is economic integration worth this kind of unfairness, extravagance and discrimination? That is the $12 million question we are voting on today.

Let us not be fooled by the proviso in this bill which says that rent supplements cannot be used in communities without community development plans. This proviso is supposed to keep rent supplements out of the suburbs. It will not. This proviso is a red herring.

The administration cannot allow rent supplements to be kept out of the suburbs—this is the keystone of the administration plans for economic integration. The proviso is a trick—so do not be fooled by it.

The reason the proviso has to be sacrificed is that the rent supplement scheme will work only if supplemtnts can be used in the suburbs. Only 221(d)(3) markets interest rate projects can be used for rent supplements and it is not economic to build them in downtown areas. They must be built in the outskirts of cities and in the suburbs.

In late February, Secretary Weaver said that costs would be kept below $15,000 per unit for rent supplement housing. The Archdiocese of New York has told me that this means that the program can be used to build units only in the outskirts of cities and in the suburbs. This is fine for the administration because that the kind of housing it wants.

But I do not think this is what the Congress wants. Do we want to vote for wasteful construction in the suburbs to house subsidized families at twice the cost of downtown public housing?

Let me take my own New York area. Rent supplement housing will not be built in the blighted areas of Manhattan, Broolykn and the Bronx. Instead the program will be used to push economic integration in Staten Island, Queens and the north Bronx—and even more in places like Yonkers, Pearl River, Glen Cove and nearby New Jersey and Connecticut suburbs.

This housing will be built in wasteful fashion. There will be many abuses of income limits. The documentation on this is available. The Washington Post has written articles on how FHA income limitations have been maladministered right here in Washington. We can be sure that rent supplements—where the FHA resents the limitations—will be more sloppily administered. Speaking of sloppy FHA administration, the April Reader's Digest has a very interesting article entitled "The Stench at FHA." It seems that FHA pays wasteful and absurd prices for housing no one wants, and then get stuck with the housing. The article went on to say that one reason FHA likes the rent supplement is that they can fill up these lemon projects with rent supplement tenants to cover up their mistakes.

I have another answer to this whole problem. It is this. Let us defeat the rent supplement appropriation and force the administration to come clean and start fresh. I am sure that if they think about it, they can produce a program that is aimed at housing needs and not economic integration.

The people do not want rent supplements. The rent subsidy idea was overwhelmingly beaten a few years ago in a New York State referendum. All the suburban and upstate counties voted overwhelmingly against it. So did my urban Bronx district and other city districts. I understand that out of dozens of congressional districts surveyed in questionnaires not one favors the rent supplement.

This program is a fraud. It seeks economic integration and not maximum provision for low-income housing. It looks and sounds more like a $12 billion than $12 million scheme.

This program should be voted down. The people have spoken. They have told us. They have told us this program is wrong, and doubly wasteful while we are at war. I wish our boys in Vietnam could have a referendum on this waste. They would tell us our duty. Let us show the people we know our duty by defeating this appropriation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this Congress we heard a great deal about the new Republican image that was about to be created. We were told that a new image of the Republican Party was about to come into being. If the gentleman from New York is the spokesman for the new Republican image, may I say that the Democrats need have no fear in the forthcoming election. The Republican hierarchy has been most vociferous in stating their determination to find new ways to win the big city vote.

Again I say that if this opposition to rent supplements is an example of the way the Republicans intend to campaign in the cities to try to get votes, we Democrats need have no fear. This is the old hard line Republican opposition to human needs and prcsents nothing new.

This is an example of the ancient, typical Republican program of cutting expenditures at the expense of human needs.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that is vital to the people of all the big cities. It is a program that is necessary to save marginal neighborhoods from sliding into slum neighborhoods. This is a program that offers hope to the people who now are forced to live in slum neighborhoods to obtain decent housing at prices within their income. It will give them the chance—the outside chance of raising their children in decent neighborhoods, of carrying out the promise of the Housing Act of 1949 of providing housing for all American families. This program will permit the owners of old housing, housing which desperately needs to be rehabilitated to bring new housing up to date.

For months I have been working with my civic and neighborhood groups to find the channels for recovering and giving life to blighted neighborhoods and to marginal neighborhoods. It is almost impossible because of high land and construction costs. This program offers hope—it offers a tool to the people to help themselves.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York who, may I say, refused to yield to my side.

Mr. FINO. My time was limited.

Mr. YATES. Of course. I have an unlimited 5 minutes. The gentleman from New York, of course, had only 13 minutes.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman apparently did not listen to what I had to say.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman listened completely to what the gentleman from New York had to say. He understood his points completely.

Mr. FINO. Then I am glad that the gentleman listened and listened carefully. I said that under the regulations and under the law there is a limitation on the amount of money that can be spent per unit, and that limitation is $15,000 per unit. The archdiocese of New York City stated, and I am sure the archdiocese of Chicago will feel the same way and will express the same sentiment, that with labor costs, as the gentleman from Chicago indicated, and the land costs, it is physically impossible to build any of thcse projects in the city of New York, and they will only be able to be built in the outskirts and in the suburbs. The gentleman has shown such great concern about housing in Chicago. I appreciate that because I am also concerned about housing in New York City. But this is not the program under which you can do it.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is completely wrong because this is the program under which could permit it to be done in the cities. The gentleman advocated the building of the same hugh high rise public housing projects rather than this program. Again, he is wrong. The only way that you can get away from that kind of institutionalized high rise housing—and every expert on public housing is unanimous in the opinion that we ought to get away from that kind of public housing—the only way you can get away from housing of that type is through a program of this kind. The poor, the disabled, the elderly, the displaced who now have only a most limited housing market desperately need this appropriation.

In a conversation I had with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY], who last year led the fight against this program, Mr. HARVEY indicated that in view of the changes that have been made in the regulations, he has changed his mind. The gentleman is one of the enlightened Republicans who appreciates what is happening in the Nation's cities, and who sees the needs of the people of the cities for this program.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. What is wrong with building this type of program in suburban areas?

Mr. YATES. Let me ask the gentleman from New York to answer that question since he raised that point.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me finish my question. Are not these people of low income entitled to God's sunshine and greener pastures? What is wrong with building these projects in suburban areas?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from New York objected. I say to him answer if you will.

Mr. FINO. I have no objection to providing adequate and suitable housing for poor people. But under this bill you are providing luxury apartments for the poor people.

Mr. YATES. Luxury apartments? The gentleman has a strange idea of what is luxurious.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 3 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding. I just want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from New York is a very knowledgeable and capable Congressman. He is on our committee. He does a splendid job, and I am quite sure, he does not want to mislead the Members of this House.

Mr. YATES. May I point out to the gentleman that even a most perfect Congressman can be wrong at times.

Mr. BARRETT. I am quite sure you are correct. I know the gentleman from New York would not come on this floor and mislead Members on either side. He knows the luxurious high-rise apartments that he speaks about being used for rent supplementations could not be used because the law provides they must be used only where there is substantial rehabilitation.

No luxurious apartment can be used. It has to be a modest-cost structure.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. Let me point out that every big city in this country has declared war on slums. How are they going to eliminate the slums if they do not have a program of this type to help them do it?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman who is a ranking member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the gentleman from New York knows this. There are 100,000 persons waiting to get into public housing in the city of New York alone.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to my friend from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to the fact that the gentleman now in the well is one of the best authorities in this House on public housing. When I came to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, I served with the gentleman from Chicago before he left the Congress a few years ago. No one was a better champion, no one had more knowledge of this program than the gentleman who is now in the well. No one understands the program any better than he does.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Chicago whether or not in his judgment he believes this program on rent supplements is a better program than public housing in the long run and is probably the answer to some of the difficult problems that now occur in public housing?

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his encomium. I think it is ill deserved, but I am grateful for it, nevertheless.

For years, experts in the field of housing have been looking for alternatives to the huge, high-rise buildings in the cities with which people of low income are housed. This program is one of the constructive alternatives which has been proposed. It deserved to have a trial. That is all we seek. Every big city in the country needs this program to stop the mounting blight and decay in their older neighborhoods. They want to eliminate the slums. This is one way they can do it. Let me give you a few facts about the program.

Congress authorized this new approach to better housing for poor people last summer, but failed to provide funds. In my district, and I am sure this is true in yours too, there is great interest in the rent supplement program, and people are wondering when it is going to get underway.

In cities like my own city of Chicago, housing for poor people has become critical. We know that public housing is not the answer, although it can continue to help. We need to enlist the active support of private enterprise and the support of public spirited private groups to help solve this problem before it gets worse.

That is why the rent supplement program is so important. For the first time, we have found a way for private enterprise to supply decent, safe, and sanitary housing for the poor.

At the same time, this program does not penalize poor people when their situation improves. A family will not be forced to move when that family's income increases. The family can continue to occupy the same living unit indefinitely, if it chooses to do so.

However, as a family's income goes up, the rent supplement will go down. The family will pay 25 percent of its income toward the rent, and the supplement will make up the difference. The supplement will be paid directly to the housing owner on submission of monthly statements for tenants who have been previously determined by FHA to meet eligibility requirements, as set forth in the law.

Every tenant will be required to recertify his income once a year. FHA will check the statements of income and will make adjustments in the amount of supplement. In addition, each lease will require the tenant to report immediately if his income increases to the point where he is no longer eligible for a supplement. But, as I said before, he will not have to move even if he no longer receives a supplement.

I want to see private enterprise given a chance to provide housing for the poor. Only private nonprofit groups, limited dividend organizations, or cooperatives can sponsor rent supplement projects. They will be subject to cost certification and rent control; and sponsors will be carefully screened to make sure they are capable of successfully developing and operating housing projects for low-income people.

May I point out that the National Association of Real Estate Boards has given its approval to this program?

Does the gentleman from New York consider this group as the one which favors socialized housing?

We cannot afford to spend money for education, job training, and social guidance, and leave the poor in their slums. Nor can the Federal Government, or the cities, build or finance the housing that is needed. Rent supplement projects will be privately built and owned, they will be privately financed by private lenders at market interest rates, and they will be privately managed and operated. They will either be nonprofit, or profits will be strictly limited and rents will be controlled.

Only families and individuals whose gross income is low enough to qualify them for public housing will be eligible to receive rent supplements. In addition, they must be living in substandard housing now, or must be elderly, handicapped, displaced, or victims of a disaster which

has destroyed or severely damaged their home.

Both new housing and rehabilitated housing will be eligible for rent supplements. The rehabilitation must be substantial. This is not a bailout program. Each project will have to be approved and insured by FHA.

In Chicago, and I know this is true in other cities, there are many sound buildings which are too good to be torn down, and which could be rehabilitated under the rent supplement program to provide decent housing. Also, there are sites where new housing can be built, even within the modest cost limits that will be set.

Private builders, realtors, lenders, churches, and other nonprofit groups, and their spokesmen have voiced strong support for this program. It is unusual, and very significant, in my opinion, for a program of this kind to develop such widespread interest and support.

Since last summer, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and we in Congress have had an opportunity to study this program carefully. Rules and policies have been developed for its administration which will make sure that rent supplements will go only to low-income people, as Congress intended. Asset limitations have been modified, so that only those with assets of $2,000 or less will be eligible for rent supplements. An exception will be allowed for persons 62 years of age or older, where the asset limitation will be $5,000.

Income limits have been furnished us for all of the larger cities and many of the smaller ones, so that we know these limits will be the same as for admission to public housing in the same cities. They will actually be lower, because gross income of all persons in the family will be used to determine eligibility for rent supplements. In public housing, most local housing authorities permit some deductions for children and other dependents.

The need for this program is urgent. The unrest in our cities cannot be allowed to fester in the slums without hope. The time to do something about it is now. I urge the House to vote up this appropriation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois has made somewhat of a political issue of this in accusing the Republicans of not being interested in these people in the slums. I think this is an unfair accusation.

May I point out that the Democrats have had the control of this House for about 32 years. They have done nothing about it. That is the reason why the Republicans are beginning to move into the cities, because the Democrats have failed. They have made these promises for years and have not done anything about them.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman used my name.

Mr. BOW. No, I did not. I called him the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. That is right. Let me point out to the gentleman, it is because of the programs of the Democratic Party over the last 32 years that so many Democrats are elected from the cities and so few Republicans are.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is mistaken about that, and time will tell.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it eminently clear at this point that the Mr. HARVEY who was referred to by the gentleman from Illinois was not the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am pleased to yield to my friend.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the observation that the Republicans who win the big cities do so by going around constantly denying the fact that they are running on the Republican ticket.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman's remark deserves no answer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this item for rent supplements which was in the supplemental appropriations bill of last October was deleted chiefly because Congress had done such a poor job in authorizing the rent supplement program in the legislation which passed the House on June 30th of last year. One of the main arguments against the bill was that everything was left to the Secretary; that he had too much discretion in administering the program. The regulations that were promulgated by the Housing and Home Finance Agency last fall were the best evidence, in my judgment, that these allegations against the bill were well-founded. It was obvious that the program to be administered had become not a program for the low income groups, but a program for the rich.

This House on October 14, 1965, by a vote of 185 to 162, made clear that it did not approve of the regulations which had been drafted, nor the manner in which this program was going to be administered. That vote reemphasized the clear language contained in section 101 (c) of the authorizing legislation; namely, that a qualified tenant under the rent supplement program must be one who had an income below the maximum amount for occupancy in public housing. In other words, we said this program is going to be one for the low income groups or there would not be any program at all. My point is—that because Congress was willing to rise up and assert its authority; to stand firm for the program it had originally intended; we can now take pride and point to a much better program. Several important changes have been made:

First. Income limits for the rent supplement program have been established. These limits are, in each instance, within the limit set for public housing and, in some cases, they are substantially below that of public housing.

Second. Stringent asset limitations have been established. Last October, I could argue, in theory at least, persons with assets of $25,000 could still qualify for the program, but that is no longer true. Individuals or families will not be eligible to participate in the rent supplement program if their assets exceed $2,000, except that in the case of the elderly the applicable limit will be $5,000. This is well within the asset limit in all localities, and substantially below the limit in many. I believe it is a reasonable requirement to qualify.

Third. In addition, specific dollar rental ceilings and mortgage ceilings have been established. These limitations make clear that these are going to be low cost units.

All in all, I believe the program has been substantially improved. I point out to you also that the National Association of Real Estate Boards, who last fall agreed that the regulations were so loosely drawn that they could not support the program, have now reversed themselves and they completely support the present effort.

It is true that not all of the objections to the program have been removed, and it can still be argued with merit that too much discretion is within the administrator; that, at best, these changes are written only into the regulations and not into the law; and that the regulations themselves can be changed once again by the administrator just as swiftly as they have been in the past. I fully recognize the merit in this argument, but I want to state that I have complete confidence and trust in the honesty of Secretary Weaver and his associates. I point out to you that it was their basic honesty in promulgating regulations last fall, before the program had been properly funded, that got them into trouble. I have been assured by Secretary Weaver in writing that these changes will all be included in the administration of this new program, and I will secure permission to insert a copy of his letter into the RECORD immediately following my remarks. I have no doubt in my mind that these changes will be carried out.

To many of you who still do have doubts, however, let me remind you that the rent supplement program will have to be funded again in 2 months and then again each year thereafter. I personally intend to keep following it closely in order to learn how well it does the job.

I am satisfied in my own mind that there is in America a great need for low-income housing. I feel strongly, as Senator Robert Taft so aptly stated in a speech he gave on January 25, 1949, and I quote:

> I believe that the American people feel that with the high production of which we are now capable, there is enough left over to prevent extreme hardship and maintain a minimum standard floor under subsistence, education, medical care and housing, to give to all a minimum standard of decent living and to all children a fair opportunity to get a start in life.

I might say to you that the title of this speech by Senator Taft, which was given at New York University before the Graduate School of Business Administration, was "Private Enterprise Has Not Solved

the Housing Problem." Senator Taft stanchly defended public housing. Just listen to his words:

Many have denounced public housing as a communistic or socialistic enterprise. Of course, to a certain extent it is true that it is socialistic in nature. But this question of socialism is a relative matter. We have long socialized our public education in the primary and secondary schools. We have socialized medical care to the extent that we provide medical care to the poor through public hospitals. But this does not mean that we have socialized medical care as a whole, or the medical profession. The public housing program is in no sense a socialization of the building industry, or of the housing industry. It is intended to reach only those whose income is so low as to prevent their renting the minimum of decent housing.

As a mayor in Michigan I found that public housing was a useful tool in meeting head on the problems of both low income and minority groups. To the best of my knowledge, it has never interfered with the private market for housing.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anyone would quarrel with the statement that this program is now vastly improved. Frankly, I believe that Congress ought to do this more often. It serves a useful purpose to occasionally send a program back and say, "No, this isn't the way we intended it to be administered." We have not done this nearly enough in Congress.

But now that the rent supplement program has been improved, I think we ought to recognize the need for low-income housing that exists and give this program a chance so that we might learn whether it can assist in solving the problem.

The $30 million which Secretary Weaver requested has already been cut to $12 million. I believe this is a modest and reasonable sum for a beginning. What Senator Taft said about public housing is equally true about this rent supplement program:

It is intended to reach only those whose income is so low as to prevent their renting the minimum of decent housing.

Let us give this program a chance to see whether it can help provide housing for the low-income groups in America.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following letter:

THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1966.

HON. JAMES HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARVEY: In view of your continuing interest in the rent supplement program, I want to take this occasion to inform you of the actions we have already taken to conform this program to the intent of the Congress. I also want to give you my firm assurance that the Department of Housing and Urban Development will administer this program strictly in accord with that intent.

With respect to income limits under the program, we have established maximum dollar amounts for localities. These amounts are in each instance within the income limit established in the same locality for public housing. The income limits for the rent supplement program applicable in 51 cities with a population of over 250,000, and in 20 cities with a population under that figure are enclosed.

In New York City these limits will be below those established locally for the public housing program for families having five or more persons. In the communities where there is at present no low-income public housing, we will establish by appropriate surveys what the income limits would be if such a program were active, and those limits will apply to the rent supplement program.

In addition, we have established stringent asset limitations. Individuals or families will not be eligible to participate in the rent supplement program if their assets exceed $2,000, except in the case of the elderly, where the applicable limit will be $5,000. This is well within the asset limits usually imposed in the public housing program by local housing authorities.

To help assure that the rent supplement program will provide only housing of modest standards, we have imposed specific dollar rental and mortgage ceilings that cannot be exceeded in any locality. These ceilings will be made more restrictive in each individual locality where lower cost levels make tighter mortgage ceilings and monthly rental ceilings possible. These will be determined on the basis of prototype projects of modest design and costs. Such items as swimming pools, two bathrooms, and air conditioning will not be permitted in these projects.

Finally, our procedures will require annual recertification of the income of all families (except the elderly, who are exempted from this requirement by the statute); and in addition, we will require families to report interm increases in income which make them ineligible to receive rent supplement assistance.

As you can see, we have made a careful effort to restrict the rent supplement program to families of low income and to assure that the housing provided is of modest design.

In administering this program, we will of course follow the intent of the Congress as expressed during the appropriations process as well as during the enactment of the enabling law. In this connection, I am enclosing for your information the statement which I presented to the House Committee on Appropriations and the departmental justification for funds for the rent supplement program.

Sincerely yours
ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Secretary.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the rent supplement appropriation contained in this bill. The reasons for launching this program were pressing last year, when we voted in favor of the authorization bill for rent supplements. Today, the same reasons exist, and they daily grow more urgent.

So many of the problems of our Nation's cities are outgrowths of the existence of large, ghettolike areas of substandard housing. Many of these problems have grown more serious than the housing and education problems in which they are rooted. Crime and unemployment among unskilled and undereducated citizens of these areas have become primary and costly concerns of Government in the past decade.

The rent supplement concept has the unique feature of providing decent housing to low income families, while at the same time helping to break down the slumlike uniformity and stagnation of ghetto areas. It does this not by mammoth and testeless public housing projects which do little to change the character of poor neighborhoods, and not by setting up the Federal Government as a ghetto landlord, but by working within the private enterprise system of real estate and housing development.

The real estate board in my constituent city of Rochester, N.Y., has forged a profound argument in favor of this program. Donald A. Lum, a realtor and chairman of the Greater Rochester Development Committee, supplied me with this statement, which because of its special relevance to the discussion of this appropriations bill, I would like to submit it at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF THE RENT-SUPPLEMENT CONCEPT, BY THE REAL ESTATE BOARD OF ROCHESTER, N.Y.

The problems are not basically housing, not basically color; the problems are people and neighborhoods. Yet the problem also is our whole city structure.

The city is a complex fabric woven from the dreams, imagination, skills, sweat, and the will of the people who live there and derive their livelihood; who use and contribute to the industries, commerce, arts, religious, educational, and cultural facilities.

The city has been described as one of the great achievements of man because the city can be created only through the cooperation and utilization of the energies and thoughts of many people of diverse interests and backgrounds working toward common goals.

As realtors we are convinced of the desirability and feasibility of rebuilding our cities, of renewing those sources of strength and vitality which makes the city the dynamic living organism it is today, and will be increasingly, in the future.

We are convinced that it is not necessary to wait for obsolescence and deterioration to take their toll completely before embarking on programs to rebuild those areas and sections which have outlived their usefulness to the rest of the community. We can afford to pay the price. We are willing to pay the price not only in terms of money, but in terms of frustrations, setbacks, loss in services, and conveniences so long as it is apparent that what we are doing will result in neighborhoods having the dynamic stability required for the healthy growth and development of families, businesses, industries, churches, schools, and other institutions which are the city.

Many of our urban problems arise today from the inability of people to establish themselves as an identifiable part of the community. This problem becomes increasingly acute as the economic pressures resulting from inadequate incomes increase the difficulties and the uncertainties surrounding the individual.

Today, inadequate income is most frequently an indicator that other basic problems of health, training, education, or attitudes exist.

It is the low income family that is most in need of the stabilizing influences available in the healthy, established neighborhoods.

It is these same stabilizing influences that low-income families are deprived of when the urban renewal bulldozer goes to work, or when vast public housing projects are built.

The common procedure in past projects, such as the two in Baden-Ormond area and the numerous other projects including inner loop, and civic center, has been for the families and businesses who are best able, to move out of the neighborhood at the earliest indications that a clearance project would take place. The vacancies left behind frequently were filled by people substantially less well off economically and generally less suited to carry on the leadership functions.

The process continued, frequently over a period of 2 to 3 years, with the pro-

portions of newcomers increasing and with practically all vestiges of stabilizing influences being removed, until finally the day came when the bulldozers took over.

As the families were bulldozed out of this neighborhood into the next, they found that neighborhood to be in transition also, with the more able families leaving and single-family dwellings being converted for occupancy by two, three, and four families; with apartments being turned into rooms and with kitchens and bathrooms being shared by several persons or families. It is doubtful whether people of normal income, normal health, normal competency could face these conditions without cracking up.

The problem frequently is compounded when people see their life savings, represented by investments in homes and businesses, wiped out or at least seriously depreciated by the costs of moving and by the inequities of the present system of paying for these properties which must be acquired by the city.

Realtors are aware that the shocks and problems of dislocation must be minimized, and that it is not sufficient to answer all objections by saying that you've got to break the eggs in order to make the omelete. After all, cities are for people.

We recognize the seriousness of the problems and the diversity of the people and of the neighborhoods which comprise our city. We recognize further the importance of maintaining a traditional landlord-tenant relationship between people, as contrasted with the Government agency-client relationship of public housing. We recognize the need for ingenuity, flexibility, adaptability, and speed in meeting the problems. We believe this can be developed when private enterprise is offered adequate incentive. Realtors have long favored rent supplement concepts coupled with code enforcement as a means of producing housing within the framework of our American way of life at prices and under conditions that will meet the needs of lower income families.

While the final details of the proposals for rent subsidies endorsed by President Johnson have not been finally ironed out, we believe the proposed FHA rent supplement program, provided that it is limited to families within the eligibility ranges of public housing, will be of incalculable assistance in providing housing for elderly families, for families displaced by governmental action, for the physically handicapped and for those living in substandard housing. We believe such a program will result in construction of substantial amounts of new rental housing and rehabilitation of housing within the inner city for low-income families. Such housing would pay its full share of local taxes and would pay going interest rates. Subsidy would be to the mortgagor rather than to individual tenants; neighborhoods would be strengthened rather than destroyed. Many investors and nonprofit organizations would be interested in participation in this type of housing development in the neighborhoods where it is most needed.

Fernwood Village, Ramona Park, and Norton Village have all demonstrated the feasibility of limited profit housing and the acceptance of this form of subsidized housing by both the community as a whole and the tenants themselves.

We believe that a rent supplement program together with the intelligent administration and persistent enforcement of the minimum standards housing code as long advocated by realtors, offer two of the most important tools available for rebuilding our neighborhoods, for assuring decent, wholesome, adequate housing for families at all income levels, for establishing and maintaining the dynamic stability and the diversity of nieghborhoods required for a healthy community.

People tend to seek out neighborhoods where they will find a community of interests similar to or compatible with their particular aims or problems at that particular stage of their life. As their interests and requirements change, most people tend to seek neighborhoods that fulfill their requirements at that time.

Let's recognize that we are dealing with people whose problems are not the usual ones, whose standards are not necessarily compatible with the middle-class white standards which govern the conduct of major portions of the city.

Let's concentrate effective services in areas where they are needed. Let's have the schools, the teachers, the police, the social services, the firemen, the city officials who are ready and able to meet the challenges of the neighborhoods that are "different."

Let's recognize that we don't solve problems by building huge new public housing projects, creating new ghettos, substituting Government agencies for normal landlord-tenant relationships. We can't hide our problems in these projects no matter how vast nor how cleverly concealed.

We can't give people decent housing or decent jobs or decent schools or decent stores or decent government. We can help people to achieve these goals if we and they really want them. We have the tools if we will use them. We have a city dedicated to rebuilding. Let's use the proper tools. Let's have the will to do the job, let's rely on the forces of private enterprise operating within a framework of intelligent government participation, and community responsibility. Let's not try to foist these problems off onto the housing authority or other Government agency, then stand back and say we've done the best we could.

In closing I'd like to read a biting little poem by John Ciardi, poetry editor of the Saturday Review:

"IN MY FATHER'S HOUSE THERE ARE A FEW MANSIONS, MORE HOVELS, AND PROBABLY EVEN MORE RANCH HOUSES

"Some men live in, say, houses and some in their own monuments. The poor live in what they can get; the rich, in what they can imagine of themselves; the clerks, in what they are told to imagine through the picture windows.

"Given the money for it, a man can begin to buy whatever it is that furnishes his imagination. Given no money, he is left to live without the furniture for his own attitudes. Given some—more or less—money, a man fits his attitudes to the furniture he is allowed to buy with what he is given.

"Given a picture window, citizen, make sure it looks out onto something. Which is also to say, out from something, preferably, I suggest, a self.

"JOHN CIARDI,
"Poetry Editor,
"The Saturday Review."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, if anyone has been deluded into believing that the Johnson controlled, rubberstamp Congress intends to heed the danger signs of inflation, this bill should disillusion them.

Today for the second time since Congress convened last January, this House of Representatives is called on to vote money under a supplemental bill. In other words, the President is now saying that he did not ask for enough money last year; either that or in other cases be deliberately withheld his request for money for other reasons—some perhaps justified, some not—but the result in either case was to make the budget deficit appear smaller when it was submitted. Instead of the $5.3 billion deficit as originally estimated, now it looks like it will run $6.4 billion.

Aside from the various reasons that resulted in this bill and the $2½ billion it would appropriate, as I said at the start, it now becomes clear that the Johnson administration is in no mood to cut down domestic spending or to defer new domestic programs even in the light of the spiraling costs of Vietnam.

For example, this bill contains $12 million for the controversial new rent supplement program to have the Federal Government pay up to two-thirds of a family's rent in certain cases. Thereby the Federal Government will embark and be on its way with the new L.B.J. 40-year, $6 billion Great Society program.

Also in this bill is $10 million for the new Federal Teachers Corps under which the U.S. Commissioner of Education will recruit, indoctrinate, and pay the salaries of a group of schoolteachers and thereby could well initiate a new encroachment into local schools.

I oppose these new programs as such, but aside from that, at this time it seems especially ill advised for Congress to fan the fires of inflation with new costly programs. In this connection, a recent Gallup poll has reported living increases so that it costs a family of four about $18 more a week to meet its expenses this year than it did a year ago. The situation requires fiscal restraint by Government or increased taxes or perhaps both.

Meanwhile, the administration, as someone said, wants to discipline the people instead of itself.

Mr. Chairman, this bill as reported by the committee represents much unnecessary Government domestic spending and unless substantially reduced I intend to vote against it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, there is particular feature among several in this, the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1966, which can do particularly well without at this time. I refer to the provision for funds to start up a new program of subsidies for rent.

This program was rejected last year when Congress refused to provide funds for it. I voted against both the authorization of the program and the funds to start it up. All the reasons which applied then are just as valid today. In addition, extraordinary new costs for the war in Vietnam have been added to the burdens of the American people. And, if that were not enough, the country is facing a serious threat of inflation.

This is not a time to embark on new programs of doubtful value and enormous, nearly incalculable potential cost to the people. This is a time for prudence; a time to husband the resources of the Nation; a time to conserve, to tighten our belts; a time to bend all our efforts to the immediate tasks of defense and vital domestic programs.

It was in this spirit of prudence that I voted last week against commencing the construction of a mansion for the Vice

President. That measure did not fit the sense of priority we must have in these times. This rent-subsidy program does not fit it either.

What a paradox is presented in this bill. Last year, Congress voted to provide urgently needed new housing facilities for our men in uniform. The administration put these spending plans on the shelf as as economy measure. But now it comes to us seeking permission to begin a wholly new, unproven civilian housing program. This does not make sense to me nor does it fit my idea of justice.

PEOPLE OPPOSE RENTICARE

Mr. Chairman, every responsible poll I have seen, including one that I conducted myself, indicates clearly that the American people oppose the concept of subsidized rent. The feeling appears to be overwhelming in my district. After the vote last year, I sent out a questionnaire to postal patrons in the Second Congressional District of New Hampshire. To the question concerning rent subsidies, "In general do you favor President Johnson's proposal to subsidize rent for low-income families in lieu of additional public housing?", 1,528 answered "yes" and 4,339 answered "no."

It is true that since the defeat of renticare last year, Federal authorities have modified their regulations. Under the plan before us today, it is no longer possible for high-income families or families with small fortunes to qualify for the Federal aid, but the limits are still excessive. In any event, I want to point out that what can be made by regulations can be changed by regulations.

Mr. Chairman, let us defer this proposition; let us exercise economy, prudence, and commonsense by rejecting this new spending plan.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, the proposal before us today is to modestly fund a privately owned, privately operated, and privately financed housing program. The Federal Government is involved only to the point of providing some small assistance to low-income families and individuals in order to insure they may be able to participate in the privately financed, owned, and operated housing that will become available under this program.

When you consider the potential of the program, you quickly realize that rent supplements could provide the key to the problems that have plagued public housing for so many years. For the first time, we are recognizing that only with the cooperation and support of the private segments of our economy will we be able to make available an adequte supply of decent housing for the poor. For this reason, the program has the support of the National Real Estate Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, and the National League of Cities.

What actually is involved? What are the specifics? First, who is eligible? The persons eligible for rent supplement payment are those of low income who are displaced by governmental action; those who are elderly; physically handicapped; and those who are living in substandard housing, or housing destroyed or extensively damaged by a natural disaster.

What are the income limitations? Income limitations are the same or below those who are eligible for federally aided low rent public housing programs. For example, in Los Angeles, the largest city in the State of California, a family of four whose income is $4,300 a year or less would be eligible. Total assets of the family could not exceed $2,000. Assets of the eligible elderly could not exceed $5,000.

What if a family's income increases? All those who receive payments will be required to report immediately any increases in income that would make them ineligible for further payments. In addition, there will be an annual recertification of income that will result in a corresponding adjustment of rent supplement payments.

What kind of housing will be included? Any type of new or rehabilitated residential projects are eligible. However, mortgage and rent limitations will require that the housing be modest and economical. FHA will guarantee the development of such housing at 5¼ percent, plus the one-half of 1 percent mortgage insurance premium. Already in California some 17 different housing projects are being contemplated, housing close to 5,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, under this program any eligible low-income family would have to put 25 percent of their monthly income toward rent. This rent payment would go directly to the landlord, and the Government would make up the difference.

Mr. Thomas J. Foley, a staff writer for the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau pointed out in an excellent article in the February 27, 1966, edition of the Times that most of the opposition directed against the rent supplement program is on the basis of monumental misunderstanding. Those who oppose the program say that it is a radical departure from traditional American precepts. But, as Mr. Foley points out in his article, our history is full of examples of our Government coming to the assistance, in order to make even stronger the private segments of our economy.

Mr. Foley rightly points out that the rent supplement program is not a departure in policy, but rather an imaginative continuation of Government support for past programs such as railroad and airline expansion, oil depletion allowances, and aid to the maritime industry. In each case, Mr. Foley points out, Government help was forthcoming and appreciated on the basis that it was in the broad national interest to maintain these industries. And, as Mr. Foley suggests, it is in our broad national interest to get the poor out of substandard housing.

Most crucial in this plan is its imaginative program for partnership with private enterprise. This fact itself is important not only because private enterprise is the pillar of our economic success, but also because local cities will not suffer any decrease in revenues as a result of public housing not bearing their share of the tax burden as is now the case.

Mr. Foley concludes his article by commenting that the rent supplement program is certainly worth a try. I am in full agreement.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, although I intend to vote in favor of today's supplemental appropriation because I support the programs which it is primarily for, I want to point out that I do so with grave reservations concerning that portion of these funds that will be used by the selective service system.

I still feel, as I felt when I voted against a 4-year extension of the draft in 1963, that a full review of the program, procedures, necessity, and effect on civilian manpower needs should be conducted. This study should be made within the next year, before Congress is asked to vote on another extension in 1967.

The inequities of a system that may have been equitable in 1940, when the law was first passed, are becoming more and more evident. Most of these discriminatory aspects are not the fault of the selective service boards or the officials of the selective service system. They are the result of changes in the Nation's social structure.

Mexican-Americans, Negroes, and those persons generally in the less affluent sector of our society, bear a heavier burden than most, simply because they do not qualify for or cannot afford the methods of obtaining deferment status—primarily, attendance at an institution of higher learning.

I recently discovered another problem that is the result of our failure to update procedures, whether or not it actually results in discriminatory selection procedures it certainly could have such implications, and is a matter that should be corrected.

The problem involves the fact that in the areas in Los Angeles County where we have an extremely heavy concentration of Mexican-American citizens, there are three selective service boards operating, and only one member from these boards is of Mexican-American descent. In fact, in all of Los Angeles County, with more than 600,000 Mexican-American citizens, there seems to be only this 1 draft board member from this ethnic background.

I hasten to add that I have contacted the Selective Service System concerning this situation and have received full cooperation and courtesy. It appears that we will be able to bring about corrective action in the near future. But, this leads me to wonder what the situation is in other parts of the Nation.

Other discriminatory aspects are well known. Little has been done in the way of seeking alternatives to the draft. It is not known what effect the new Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act will have on enlistments. The rash of draft card burnings and demonstrations are an indication of the need for a complete review. The present system of practically autonomous local boards results in the deferment or drafting of some men in some communities who would have been given a different status in a different community. For instance, married men in one community are drafted, while another community with a surplus of qualified single men does not have to take any married men to fill the quota.

Adequate pay scales and other incentives may be less expensive than the Se-

lective Service System. The cost of the high turnover of personnel in the armed services may be higher than the cost of making career service more appealing. This could also give us a defense capability manned by more experienced and better trained soldiers in general.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for a change.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, the second supplemental appropriations bill, contains a controversial item. I refer to the rent supplement program. Last year I opposed the program as presented and particularly because of its proposed loose and generous application. But changes in the proposed rules and regulations now make it clear most of my former objections have been met. It is now clear that in no case will income limits be above those established for low-rent public housing. It is now clear that in addition to having a low income those qualifying must either be elderly, handicapped, displaced by Federal project, the victim of a natural disaster or living in slum housing. These are stringent, restrictive qualifying provisions. I agree with them. I now find a program which will be in the national interest. I might add that I see also the possibility that this will replace public housing which would meet with my approval. This approach has a free enterprise flavor to it which I like.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the proposal as presented.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, at the March 22, 1966, meeting of the House Republican Policy Committee a policy statement regarding the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966 was adopted. As chairman of the Policy Committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement:

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Johnson-Humphrey administration is engaging in a tragic game with this Congress. Unfortunately, the stakes in this game may be the American economic system that has produced unparalleled opportunities and abundance for our people.

In recent weeks a combination of alarming factors have created grave concern over this country's economic condition. In February the wholesale price index increased 0.7 percent, the sharpest rise since the Korean war. The cost of living continues to mount. A recent Gallup poll reported that, according to the American public's own appraisal of living costs, it takes a family of 4 about $18 more a week to get along this year than it did a year ago. And this is at a time when this country is experiencing the effetcs of accumulated deficits of 6 years of unbalanced budgets and sharply increasing defense demands.

In spite of this serious inflationary situation and the spiraling costs of a massive war in Vietnam, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has continued to insist upon a large number of new programs.

For example, in this bill there is money for rent supplements and for the Federal Teachers Corps. This is money that was requested, considered, and then rejected during the first session of this Congress.

Once an appropriation is made for rent supplements, the Federal Government will be on its way to a 40-year, $6 billion program. Also, even though the proposed regulations governing allowable income limits and assets have been tightened since last year, if funds are appropriated, Congress will have little or no control over future regulations.

The Federal Teachers Corps has had an even more checkered career. In the House of Representatives, only one witness testified on this proposal. It then was added to the Higher Education Act by the Senate. House Republican conferees refused to sign the conference report and moved to recommit the report with instructions to delete the Teachers Corps. Thereafter, the $13.2 million that would have been used to finance the Teachers Corps was removed from an appropriation measure.

Objections to the Teachers Corps center on the fact that it will be a federally financed project in which the U.S. Commissioner of Education has the extraordinary authority to recruit, select, train, and pay the salary of teachers and then choose the district, from among those that apply, in which such teachers would be assigned. Certainly, this is a new and dangerous extension of Federal power into local school districts.

The record now reflects that in fiscal 1966 the Johnson-Humphrey administration underestimated the escalating Vietnam military needs by $15 billion. And this undoubtedly will be repeated in fiscal 1967. Until such time as a realistic appraisal of the Vietnam costs is forwarded to Congress, all new and nonessential spending must be curtailed. Under the circumstances, it is both reckless and dangerous to feed the fires of inflation as this appropriations bill would do. Certainly, in this period of grave uncertainty, new starts on broad and expensive programs should not be called for in a supplemental appropriations bill. In times such as these, new spending requests should be contained in a regular appropriation request and given the careful scrutiny they deserve.

All too often, the democratically controlled Congress has earned its rubberstamp characterization. It has winked when the occasion demanded firmness. It has grinned when it should have gagged. We hope that this time Congress will respond to the challenge.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote today to appropriate funds for the rent supplement program because I believe that this program can provide an effective, efficient, economic, and needed new tool in the so far losing battle to eliminate the extensive neighborhoods of decrepit and overcrowded housing still persisting, still growing in this Nation. This trial program, conceived and proposed as a hopeful potential alternative to the yet insufficient, trouble-filled conventional public housing program, relies on and stimulates locally planned, locally financed, and locally supervised efforts to construct and renovate adequate housing, under private and cooperative ownership. Surely one of the leading causes of the social upheavals which in recent years have beset our cities is the seeming hopelessness of the situation which millions of our low-income city families perceive themselves in today. This bill, providing limited funds to allow an experimental program to get underway, deserves the support of all Members who are sincerely concerned about disturbing evolution of our cities.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the supplemental appropriations bill which we are considering today the Washington Post this morning declared:

It will provide the first real test of whether Congress is willing to build a Great Society at home and fight a war in Vietnam at the same time.

In other words, the issue is clear and simple—can we afford guns and butter as the President believes, or is now the time for a sober reassessment of our responsibilities faced as we are with a major war and wild inflation? Shall we spend more for the Great Society at home? Shall we spend more to defend our interests abroad? Shall we go further into debt thus fanning inflation? Should we reduce some of the low-priority programs? And, last but certainly not the least of the many questions facing us is "will a tax hike be necessary?"

Mr. Chairman, I supported the supplemental defense appropriations bill last week to finance the war effort, and I shall continue to support our boys in Vietnam. I support much of this bill including the 100 percent funding of the impacted school aid despite opposition from the White House and plans to cut next year's school aid by half.

But I shall not support the highly questionable rent supplement program or the unpopular Teachers Corps as contained in this bill. I shall not support new, unnecessary, and low-priority programs that will fan the fires of inflation through increased Government spending.

Looking for a moment at the history of these two programs, we find that Congress last year refused to provide funds for both in spite of the pressure placed upon us to railroad it through with the rest of the Great Society proposals. Originally, the President asked for $30 million to start a rent subsidy program that would grow in 4 short years into an annual $150 million outlay. Multiply that times 40 years as requested and you get some idea of the magnitude of this new proposal. In it the administration suggested that a family should not pay more than a quarter of their wages for rent, and anything above and beyond this arbitrary, bureaucratic determination would be paid by the Federal Government. Loose wording permitted individuals with salaries up to $10,000 in New York City to be eligible to receive monthly subsidies. For example, a family earning $9,600 annually or $800 a month should pay only $200 for rent, but should they desire to rent a $250 apartment Uncle Sam would pick up the $50 difference. Not only this, but the original administration plan allowed individuals to have assets up to twice the annual income. Thus our friend with an income of nearly $10,000 could have almost $20,000 in stocks, bonds, and other assets and still get Federal payments for his rent while his home-owning neighbor struggles to pay his mortgage.

Now socialism is something you do not talk much about, but when the Government provides for everything from the womb to the tomb, and then proposes to pay for housing too, I contend we are destroying the individualism that made this country great and the private initiative displayed by our present system of home ownership and personal payment of rent. This is why I and 184 of my colleagues last October refused to vote for funds for this boondoggle against the 163 faithful mustered by the President

and his Democrat leaders in the House of Representatives.

In the face today of all this the administration marches back up Capitol Hill with a plan to supplement rent. This bill carries a request for $12.1 million as a starter and limits the recipients to public housing eligibility incomes as an added inducement to get the needed votes. This is a transparent guise to slip through a program—buried among dozens of others—that Congress has previously rejected overwhelmingly.

But there is a logic in this apparent madness. If Congress refuses to go along many of my friends on the other side of the aisle can claim they have thwarted the President and emerge as champions of economy, free-enterprise and individualism. Those who support the bill can claim the original request has been cut and the regulations tightened thus making them believers who have followed thrift and economy. This is blatant hypocrisy in my humble opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we must learn from history not to ignore it. In the early thirties while we were in the midst of that terrible depression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt eloquently proclaimed that one-third of this Nation was "ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed." Now after over 30 years of experience in public housing our President in his state of the Union message declares:

> In some of our urban areas we must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods.

If we believe what we are told, we are as bad off today as we were in 1934.

The President in the same message said "we must change in order to master change." Certainly it is time for a change away from the failures of the past and for a change back to the proven tenents of private initiative, self-reliance and free enterprise. The highly respected Barron's Business & Financial Weekly magazine recently stated:

> For a generation cities have been defaced with thousands of public housing projects which officials now candidly label "high-rise ghettos."

We must learn if we hope to improve as we change.

And there is a great deal of change to master. Since Congress last defeated the rent supplement request the administration has escalated the war in Vietnam and the gnawing flames of inflation have burst into full flame.

Last week we approved over $13 billion more for Vietnam because the original request was deliberately kept low so the budget would look balanced and more could be set aside for unproven poverty programs. This also kept the deficit down to under $2 billion so that the administration could claim a victory, after all it could have been much more. This is hypocrisy to claim a savings because the debt is less while the books are still going further in the red.

Last year Congress appropriated funds to provide additional housing for the military in response to urgent appeals by the Defense Department. Yet as of today, Secretary of Defense McNamara has refused to use this money, over $160 million. This refusal to build family housing, military schools, chapels, and troop quarters makes it possible to come up with a smaller deficit in 1965. In a masterful public relations "tour de forse" the Department of Defense announcement claims the administration is practicing economy despite Mr. McNamara's earlier testimony before Congress when he stated:

> As soon as feasible, we shall push forward vigorously, as we have done during recent years, to build thousands of new military family housing units.

The DOD announcement proudly states:

> Although we have not met the full need for military housing units, the substantial costs of military operations in southeast Asia dictate a deferral of authorized and funded new construction in fiscal year 1966.

So on the one hand the administration is not building facilities for our soldiers sacrificing their lives to defend their Nation, but can come here to us today and ask for $12.1 million to subsidize rent. I do not agree that we can have both guns and butter as the President has promised. The Great Society can become the high society where we have our cake and eat it too, but only with higher taxes, higher prices, higher spending, and higher deficits.

To continue to travel down this road will bring a Texas-style inflation that has already started to frighten the wits out of many. And, we know that recession usually follows runaway inflation. Inflation is caused by Government spending more than any other single factor since, after all our Federal Government is the biggest single spender in the world.

The Government admitted today that the increase in inflation last month was the highest since 1951. The wholesale price index jumped more than in any single month since the Korean war, by seven-tenths of 1 percent. The journal of the financial world, Business Week, has combined the increase in January and February, multiplied these 2 months by six to get the yearly total, and points out that if projected this increased cost of living is boiling along at an alarming rate of around 7 percent.

Last year Congress increased social security by 7 percent but what good is that when a decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar wipes out the total social security increase? All it does is win some votes and through added spending push up inflation.

Inflation is no more than legalized robbery. It steals from the pension check and the pocketbook. Housewives are not so much concerned about the $2.50 a ton increase in steel as they are in the $500 a ton increase in the price of bacon. Ironically, the single largest increase in the cost of inflation last month came in higher food prices where the low and middle income Americans are hit the worst. It is the rich and powerful who benefit from uncontrolled inflation, not the ones we are supposed to be helping in these so-called antipoverty programs.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget contains $3.25 billion for new domestic programs and the expansion of other domestic programs. This bill according to page 39 of the committee report contains one-half billion dollars to start new, unproven programs. I cannot in good conscience support these at a time when we are in a major war and are faced with growing inflation. I cannot accede to these requests at a time when the President asks for a cutback in school lunch and milk programs, aid to impacted areas, college scholarship and loan programs, agriculture research and other proven programs.

If we must have higher taxes then the President must honestly face up to reality and not after November 10th. If we must spend more on the war then we must cut low-priority programs to keep from going further into the mire of debt. I believe we can no longer operate on a "business as usual" basis. We must do as Will Rogers suggested long ago in another regard, "fish or cut bait."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, so far as the rent subsidy proposition is concerned we have before us today a bill which symbolizes the Great Society and its insincerity of purpose. In his omniscient view of our affairs, President Johnson has said:

> But even a prosperous nation cannot meet all its goals all at once (budget message of the President, p. 7).

And, to back up this view, a look at the statement which accompanied the defense budget reveals that the President was so concerned, that he virtually eliminated defense housing, using these words to defend the action:

> Provision is made in the following schedules to proceed after 1966 with the construction of the 8,500 family housing units authorized and funded in 1966 but deferred in December 1965 following a review of Defense Department expenditures focused on meeting higher priority requirements in direct support of combat forces in Vietnam and elsewhere. On this basis, no additional funds are required in 1967 for new family housing construction" (appendix to the budget, p. 350).

In the light of the two statements above, it is rather phenomenal that we are considering this proposition at all. This is a new program. It may have some desirable features. However, there is a war on. The administration is talking about increasing everyone's taxes to pay for the war. If this is necessary, why are we considering a bill which would fund an expensive, entirely speculative program? What it amounts to simply, is a program that would allow the Federal Government to place people in areas that it wants them to live. In the Soviet Union this is called coercion. In the country it is called "renticare," or the rent supplement program.

It cannot be reasonable, with American GI's fighting and dying in the swamps and jungles of Vietnam, for us in Congress to enact this program. Our own President, whom I quote above, considers the war effort so important that he has cut off the building of GI housing. How can we, in good faith, enact this program which sets up Federal standards for rent across this Nation?

This bill would set up Uncle Sam as the Nation's landlord. I believe that it is significant that the pilot programs which

are now underway have as their key provisions the element of secrecy. The people in New York, Miami, and other cities that are getting renticare are doing so secretly. The director of the New York Public Housing Authority has admitted that this is necessary, because the people who are paying their own rent would object if they knew that their taxes were paying the rent of their next door neighbor.

I cannot believe that any program which must be conducted in secrecy, with public money, is sound. I cannot believe, when we cannot fund housing for our GI's, that we have any business launching a program of Federal rent subsidies.

Does not this administration realize there is a war on?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty support of the provisions of this bill which provide funds for a rent supplement program for the balance of this fiscal year. In my city of Cleveland, in excess of 85,000 families have an income of $4,000 per year or less. At the present time most of these families are compelled to live in substandard dwelling places and in slum areas.

The more we study the problem of the inner cities and the spread of blight throughout all portions of the urban area, the more it is related to the income limitations, the inability of families of low income and the elderly to acquire living accommodations at prices within the limits of family income. The rent supplement program may be by far the least expensive approach to the problem in that it involves private resources and private capital in the intitial construction and rehabilitation. It also provides a procedure that can move at once without prolonged delay.

In the city of Cleveland at this moment, two nonprofit groups are already in motion to create 358 units of sound housing under the rent supplement program. One of the sponsors plans to rehabilitate 158 units of rundown central city housing. The other intends to build 200 new units. Each group is already in possession of its site.

Comparatively, these 358 units may not seem like many, but it is a beginning. There are some 1,500 families in my city who face or who have recently faced the need to relocate because of urban renewal projects and highway improvements. These 358 units which can be immediately started if the rent supplement program is enacted will constitute a start which will ultimately change the face of the city.

The rent supplement proposal for which we seek to appropriate funds today is a modest but necessary approach to the problems of the city. The rent subsidy is certainly worth a fair chance.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, we have been the recipients of the usual guns versus butter or rifles versus ruffles arguments today from the other side of the aisle. Knowing of some of the programs in which my colleagues are interested, I am not impressed with such arguments. It is obvious the appropriation committee took out the "fat" before the issues came before us.

The attack is on the so-called new programs. Let us consider rent supplement first.

The Public Housing Administration, as of February 28, 1966, has made available 2,414 units—2,334 of which are available for occupancy—for the part of my district encompassing Dayton, Ohio. The number of active public housing applications on file as of November 30, 1965, were: 1,692; elderly or handicapped 787; displaced families 41; for a total of 2,520.

This leads me to the inescapable conclusion that there are as many low income families eligible under public housing standards, awaiting placement, as there are those who have been admitted. Furthermore, the 1960 estimate of low income families in substandard housing in Montgomery County stood at 6,000, 3,000 of whom were living in the city of Dayton.

When this bill first came before the Congress, some of my colleagues and I, on this side of the aisle, found fault with the aims, objects and purposes of this legislation. To the everlasting credit of an alert, responsive and responsible administration, the Banking and Currency Committee sponsored its own amendment restricting the system to those who qualify for public housing. To my way of thinking this was a sensible approach.

The income provisions still seemed too high and the administration again adjusted its original concept of this new program and brought the policy guidelines unmistakably within the framework of public housing limits.

This responsiveness to the will of Congress and particularly those of us who are newcomers, should not go unrewarded especially when the appropriation committee again responded to the national purse reducing the program to "bread" not "butter," and only a half a slice, at that.

A factor not made as clear as it could or should be is this program could be a real tool to relieve, at long last, the Watts ghettos of our cities resulting in redistribution of low-income families into less explosive areas.

Another point so often overlooked is the relationship of this new program to private enterprise. Quite frankly, the rent supplement program will make it possible for private nonprofit and limited dividend corporations and cooperatives to build housing of modest design.

Qualification within the public housing limits requires that families, in addition to being low income, must be elderly or handicapped, displaced by government action, living in slum housing or in homes destroyed by an act of God. The rent suplement is the difference between 25 percent of the tenant's income which would normally be paid as rent and the regular economic rent on the unit to be occupied. Family assets cannot exceed $2,000, generally, except that elderly families may receive income up to $5,000 and still qualify. To insure that units will be of modest design, cost ceilings which are below the public housing limit, have been established.

The new program, incorporating the changes above mentioned which I helped to accomplish, has the support of the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, many church groups, senior citizen organizations, unions, and others.

The 89th Congress once again can begin to fund a peoples bill in a long-neglected area through the cooperation of private enterprise and the Government, on one hand, and those in society who most need our help, on the other. While $12 million is inadequate, it will have to suffice for the time being because of other unavoidable commitments. Let us at least give crumbs of bread to begin a new program needed here at home.

In connection with the Teachers' Corps program, it is true, my district may find little need for this but there are areas where teachers are desperately needed as there are countries who rely upon our Peace Corps volunteers. The limitations attached by the subcommittee are sound although I had hoped for more than $10 million to be appropriated for this program. Considering the importance of education as related to the war on poverty, a National Teachers Corps could be a useful tool in areas where there are large pockets of poverty, particularly in those States where educational standards fall behind the Nation's average.

The committee, under title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, has recommended $11 million for the funding of the library program and $41 million under the provisions of Public Law 874, as amended, to cover 100 percent entitlement for the deficiency in impacted school areas.

For the most part, Mr. Chairman, when the Congress believes that a program is worthy of authorization, reasonable funds should be appropriated. The war in Vietnam has little to do with our needs at home and within reason, I feel both should be supported.

The Appropriation Committee should be commended for rendering yeoman service to the Congress. It came before us with a reduction of nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars and cutting where there is need is sometimes more difficult than screening where there is abundance. This was a tremendous task and I support the committee's efforts.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I feel the issue before us today is the first real test as to whether Congress is willing to fulfill its obligations at home and fight a war in Vietnam at the same time.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, in the minority report on the housing bill we warned against the possibility that the rent supplement program would set national rental standards. By agreeing to pay subsidies for rentals over 25 percent of the individual's income, the Government has, in fact, established a national rental standard.

But in so doing, I wonder if my colleagues are aware of the fact that 37 percent of the people in the United States now pay over one-fourth of their income for rent? Does the administration plan to subsidize 37 percent of the peole in the United States?

Ridiculous—no, not really, as a matter of fact, we have an example right here is the District of Columbia. Earlier this

month an article appeared in the Washington Post relating the testimony of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, the National Capitol Planning Commission's chairman, before the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. Mrs. Rowe said that a National Capitol Planning Commission study showed that between 83,000 and 144,600 families in the District pay more than 25 percent of their income for housing and therefore are eligible for some kind of public assistance. Of these 45,000 presently live in structurally sound dwellings and are not overcrowded. Mrs. Rowe went on to say:

> More than 37 percent of the city resident's are eligible for, or need, public assistance in housing: Only 5.8 percent are receiving it.

Mr. Chairman, this is only one example that has come to my attention, but I wonder how many other studies are in progress across the country showing that all families who presently pay more than 25 percent of their income for rent, need public assistance?

Mr. Chairman, does the House fully comprehend what havoc such a national rental standard could play with our housing policies across the country?

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, last year, as we all know, the Congress appropriated $450,000 for administrative expenses for the rent supplement program so that the Department of Housing and Urban Development could prepare plans and criteria for the administration of this new program.

In addition, the Department was to explore the extent of demand for this program. All reports clearly indicate the demand is present.

But, my interest at the moment is in what changes have been made in the administrative guidelines since we last considered the question of funding this program.

It certainly seems to me that DHUD has given particular attention to the questions and objections voiced by the Congress in its consideration of last year's request for appropriations for the program. The following four points are the major changes in policy made as a result of this review:

First. Income limits on eligibility for rent supplements. To be eligible for rent supplement payments a family must have an income at or below the income limits established for entrance to public housing in the various communities. In those communities which have public housing programs the income limits established for the rent supplement program are in almost every instance identical with the public housing income limits in that area. In the few localities in which there is no public housing program, rent supplement income limits will be established at the same level which would have existed if there were a public housing program.

Second. Assets limitations for eligibility for rent supplements. To be eligible for rent supplement payments a nonelderly family must have assets no greater than $2,000 and an elderly family must have assets no greater than $5,000. This asset limitation is well within the limits usually imposed in the public housing program by local authorities, and considerably below asset limitation contained in the provisional rent supplement regulations made public last year.

Third. Adjustment of rent supplement payment with changes in tenant income. All tenants receiving rent supplements will be required to recertify with appropriate documentation their current incomes each year. This recertification will be reviewed by FHA and a corresponding adjustment or elimination of rent supplement payments will be made. Families who experience increases in income sufficient to put their incomes above those required for eligibility will be, as a condition of their lease, required to report immediately to the housing owner and to FHA such increases in income. In these cases immediate adjustment of rent supplement payments will be made.

Fourth. Quality of housing to be supported by rent supplements. Housing approved by FHA for mortgage insurance and rent supplement payments may be either new construction or rehabilitation. Rehabilitation projects will be accepted only if they involve major rehabilitation or consist of projects made up largely of substandard units which will, through rehabilitation, be made into standard units. Mortgage limits and other restrictions that will be imposed by FHA will limit new construction to housing of modest design and cost. Luxury items such as swimming pools and two bathrooms will not be permitted.

I think DHUD has done a good job. I think these changes are in the right direction, and I think it is now time we give this program a chance to function.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, the second supplemental appropriations bill, before us today, includes $1 million for the operation of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. This measure was enacted last year, and resulted in what I thought then was, the culmination of one of my fondest legislative desires. For years I had endeavored unsuccessfully to generate sufficient interest in a loan insurance program for students in business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. Last year, by a vote of 300 to 0, my bill was passed by the House. It was soon thereafter passed unanimously by the Senate.

I followed this program closely in the administrative halls of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, satisfied that this category of student would no longer be denied financial assistance to pursue a chosen career. I soon found, however, that appropriations to fund the program were not among the first to be requested.

My patience has been satisfied today, as I rise to support these vital appropriations. Literally thousands of post-secondary vocational school students are awaiting these funds to pursue or continue their academic desires in a field of trade. They are well aware of this program for I have learned that they are a particular kind of student—their desire to learn is all-consuming and their personal responsibility is a matter of pride to this country.

Mr. Chairman, we need the energies of these future tradesmen and women. America cannot thrive alone on college graduates. We will never abolish our need for craftsmen, business aids, and other products of vocational schools. Let us therefore act positively and with urgency in advancing the reach of this program to ambitious students throughout the country.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Appropriations met last week to consider this second supplemental appropriations bill we were advised that this legislation now brings total appropriations for fiscal 1966 to approximately $127 billion, and this may not be the final total either.

What a sizable escalation there has been in that highly publicized budget of less than $100 billion which the President submitted to Congress in January, 1965?

Of course, we know there has been substantial escalation of the U.S. military commitment to the war in Vietnam. The first of these was for $700 million. Then $1.7 billion for Vietnam expenditures was added to the regular defense bill, and only last week we completed action on an additional $13.1 billion to support American boys in Vietnam.

It is very likely that there will be the need for additional supplemental requests later this year and early next year to make up for deficiencies in the 1967 budget.

However, emergency appropriations actions have not been limited to meeting urgent defense needs. In this bill before us today, we are asked to appropriate over $2.5 billion. It contains the initial funding of nine new programs.

We know that the situation in southeast Asia is far different today than it was when these Great Society programs were enacted last year.

For some time I have pointed to the need to establish a system of priorities on the administration's plans for domestic nondefense spending for the balance of this fiscal year and the 1967 fiscal year starting July 1, 1966.

The fires of inflation are burning brightly. There is talk of a tax increase; higher interest rates; elimination of the investment credit for industry; business and labor have been warned to hold the line on prices and wages. We hear all of these possible remedies to curb inflation. But suggestions that the administration take a new look at the budget and curtail nonessential domestic spending and defer the start of certain new programs are ignored.

In examining this appropriations request, it becomes obvious that Congress will have to take a second look at the new spending programs, in the light of the cost of the Vietnam effort, and establish some system of priorities.

When this supplemental request came to Congress, it contained requests of $30 million to fund the rent supplement program and $13.2 million to finance the new National Teacher Corp. These were

programs that the House considered and then rejected during the first session of this Congress.

However, the administration failed to request sufficient funds to provide 100 percent entitlements to over 300 school districts throughout the Nation who depend upon Public Law 874 assistance to help meet their budgetary needs. The Committee on Appropriations has included a $41 million item in this bill which will permit the Federal Government to honor its commitment to local school districts.

Years ago when this law was enacted it was the intent of Congress to assume responsibility in partnership with the local school district at any place where Federal activities have created an especially defined problem for the local community.

In Kansas, we have many school districts which annually plan their budgets on the basis of receiving Federal assistance for students who come to them for education solely because of Federal activities in their area.

These school districts were assured last year by the Office of Education that they would receive 100 percent entitlements during fiscal year 1966.

There were changes in the law made late in the last session and enrollment changes occurred which have caused the deficiency of $41 million.

The mail which I have received from Kansas school officials, and I know many of my colleagues in the House have received similar communications, forecast serious crises for many school districts unless these funds are provided. Long ago, school boards drew up and approved their 1965–66 school year budgets on the basis of receiving full entitlements under this law.

If Congress is to assume the responsibility for establishing priorities, then I believe we must support long-standing programs of education such as Public Law 874.

Mr. Chairman, following is a tabulation of the impacted school districts in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas including the full entitlement for fiscal year 1966 under Public Law 874 along with the amount they would receive without this supplemental appropriation:

4th Congressional District of Kansas entitlements under Public Law 874 with and without supplemental appropriations for 1966 fiscal year

School district	Without supplemental	With supplemental
Derby	$563,189	$639,987
Community School District No. 127	90,754	103,130
Minneha No. 137	8,880	10,091
City of Wichita No. 1	1,699,047	1,930,735
Clearwater No. 133	12,786	14,530
Valley Center	24,381	27,706
Mount Hope No. 44	3,311	3,763
Maize No. 83	10,385	11,801
Haysville No. 187	154,568	175,646
Newton	21,522	24,457
Cheney No. 141	4,967	5,644
Sedgwick No. 10	4,816	5,473
Goddard No. 142	17,609	20,010
Halstead No. 52	2,409	2,737
Lindsborg	3,010	3,420
Burrton No. 50	1,806	2,052
Abilene	13,696	15,564
Herington	6,772	7,696
Dickinson County Community High Schools	6,618	7,521
Solomon No. 1	2,709	3,078
Viola	1,957	2,224
White City No. 27	4,545	5,131
Dwight	3,911	4,444
Seltzer	10,836	12,314
Joint Rural High School No. 4, McPherson	1,806	2,052
Cheney High School No. 190	2,709	3,078
Mammoth Cave	4,816	5,473
Council Grove No. 50	2,409	2,737
Rural High School No. 91, Segdwick County	60,503	68,753
Dwight No. 4	1,957	2,224
Oatville No. 186	2,558	2,907
Florence	1,806	2,052
Marion	4,061	4,615
Total	2,757,079	3,133,045
State of Kansas	7,317,968	8,315,870

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

Rent Supplement Program

For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $100,000: *Provided*, That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against lines 6 through 22 on page 4 of the pending legislation, and desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the language contained in lines 15 through 22 are a clear violation of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, wherein clause 2 states:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Lines 15 through 22 constitute an obvious violation of that which is commonly referred to as the Holman rule in that legislation proposed in an appropriation bill must indicate by its terms an unqualified reduction of expenditures to fall within the exception to the rule.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to the language against which he has raised a point of order.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

I think the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin included lines 6 to 24. I think the lines are from line 10 through 22. The gentleman from Wisconsin may have used the committee print at the time he drafted his point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, my point of order applies to the complete section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he understood the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin to apply to the language in that entire paragraph beginning on line 6 and running through line 22 on page 4.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I can assure my colleagues that I am directing my full attention to the language that appears in this bill on page 4, from line 9 through line 22.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the language in lines 15 through 22 would require the utmost of speculation for one to assume that any retrenchment whatsoever in expenditures would occur. On the contrary, the language might increase expenditures significantly in that under existing law there is no requirement for either a workable program or for local approval by a community desiring rent supplements. These workable programs require a great deal of administrative expenditure at the Federal level prior to their approval by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Because at the present time communities wishing to participate in rent subsidies are specifically exempted from the provisions of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 requiring workable programs, the language of the proviso would demand additional administrative costs by the Federal Government.

Second, the law is clear in stating that any contract for rent supplements would not be between Federal and local governments, but rather between the Federal Government and private builders and or private nonprofit, limited dividend, religious and philanthropic organizations. Any retrenchment in expenditures resulting from this language, therefore, would be purely speculative.

Third, lines 15 through 22 would require further speculation in order to arrive at the conclusion that fewer communities would participate under the rent subsidy program. There is no reason to believe that every single community in the United States would not willingly follow the requirements imposed by the proviso.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it would be purely speculative to assume that the full $12 million appropriated by this bill would not be used in its entirety by participating communities. The Committee on Appropriations has received testimony indicating that communities which have elected to participate, including those that already have a workable program, have submitted requests for rent subsidy projects far exceeding the $12 million contained in this bill.

The rules of the House demand that the reduction of an expenditure must appear as a certain and necessary measure and not as a probable or possible contingency.

Further, to come within the exception to the rule prohibiting legislation on an appropriation bill, it has been held on numerous occasions that it is not within the province of the Chair to speculate upon the contingencies which might or might not operate to retrench expenditures.

If, on the other hand, lines 15 through 22 be considered a limitation on an appropriation, rather than an exception to the rule prohibiting legislation on an appropriation, then it must be negative and in the nature of a veto. When it assumes affirmative form by direction to an executive in the discharge of his duties under existing law it ceases to be a limitation and becomes legislation.

The language says, *"Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program" or which is without local official approval. In short, no appropriations may be used for projects which are not—an obvious double negative construction resulting in a positive direction of officials administering the program. On May 29, 1924, the Chair held that an amendment proposing an affirmative direction through use of a double negative, though in the form of a limitation, was not in order on a general appropriation bill.

Moreover, it has been ruled on numerous occasions that a limitation upon an appropriation must not be accompanied by provisions requiring affirmative action by an executive in order to render the appropriation available.

In the matter before us, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would be required affirmatively to approve a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. Presently, section 101 of the Housing Act of 1965 authorizing a rent supplement program is exempt from the provisions of section 101(c) of the 1949 act, as amended, requiring a workable program by communities seeking to become eligible for certain other Federal aid housing programs. With passage of the bill before us, however, the Secretary would be required, by law, affirmatively to approve workable programs prior to permitting the expenditure of any of the appropriations contained in the bill before us. The bill sets forth new standards demanding affirmative action, not negative. To presume that the language contained herein would require that the Secretary first say "No" to each and every one of the thousands of communities without workable programs is too ridiculous to consider seriously. One does not veto a nonaction. Rather, one approves or disapproves an application meeting the requirements of the proviso, and there is nothing in that proviso that presupposes a veto on his part.

Instead, the proviso is directed in its entirety to the nebulous motives of communities that may or may not desire rent supplements. Nobody knows how many—if any—communities will fit that description and therefore be affected by the proviso. It could be many, it could be none. If none, the proviso does not constitute a limitation. Of course, he would await proper application by the local community desiring rent supplements, which community might or might not already have a workable program, and then the language before us would demand that he affirmatively approve that workable program as a prerequisite to further consideration for rent supplements where none previously existed.

On May 11, 1920, the Chair ruled in a similar situation:

> While consideration must be given to the form of the amendment proposed as a limitation for the purpose of determining whether it is in fact a limitation, still the question whether it is a limitation or not must in the last analysis be determined by whether it is negative upon the appropriation or an affirmative direction addressed to the discretion of the officer for whose department the appropriations are made. While the pending amendment is in the form of a limitation applying to the entire appropriation, it in fact undertakes to direct the discretion of the Secretary of Labor in a matter in which he now has full discretion.

The point of order was sustained.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that lines 15 through 22 do, indeed, undertake to direct the discretion of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in a matter in which he now has full discretion. This is not a matter of conjecture, it is a matter of record and law. Presently he has full discretion to approve rent supplement projects anywhere in the country; lines 15 through 22 undertake to direct his discretion by demanding a positive act of approval meeting the requirements set forth in the proviso.

It has been further held by the Chair on January 31, 1925, that while the House may by limitation deny an appropriation to recipients lacking certain qualifications, a professed limitation which by interdiction of certain qualifications restricts lawful executive action is not in order. Likewise, in the matter before us, the imposition of additional duties upon the part of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in approving or disapproving certain requirements of local communities not presently required by law constitutes legislation.

On January 14, 1929, the Chair held that a proposition to restrict administrative functions vested in an executive by law is legislation and is not in order as a limitation. Section 101(f) of Public Law 89–117 amends section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, by specifically removing from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development the burden of having to first approve a so-called workable program for community improvement prior to granting funds for rent supplements. The proviso therefore represents a restriction of administrative functions vested in an executive by prior law. In this regard the ruling of the Chair last October 14 was based upon a misleading contention by the gentleman from Ohio who made the point of order.

It was stated to the Chair that amendments were considered and rejected by the Committee on Banking and Currency that would have required workable programs prior to approval by the Secretary for rent supplements. This may or may not be true, but in so stating, my distinguished colleague may have left the impression that section 101 rent supplement applications merely were not required, rather than specifically exempted from the provisions of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The gentleman should have stated that section 101(f) authorized the Secretary, in his discretion, to approve rent supplements, notwithstanding the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949. In fact, the Committee on Banking and Currency considered this matter and wrote it into the law. In short, on this point, the law of the land is not silent.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I contend that lines 6 through 22 on page 4 of the bill constitute neither a limitation on an appropriation nor a retrenchment of expenditures under the exceptions to the rule and should be held to be not in order.

This language will not affect expenditures to the extent of $1 and therefore is not clearly a limitation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the entire language is negative and does not require any additional duties. Moreover, I would point out that the language in this bill is identical to the language that was in the bill last year, without any change, and this was ruled upon on October 14, 1965, at which time the point of order was overruled.

My friend has cited irrelevant cases in other departments, but I would cite

him one, just on the point, with the specific, identical language which has already been ruled upon—and a precedent has been established.

Moreover, the language in the Urban Renewal and Housing Development Act of 1965, title I, places responsibility on the Committee on Appropriations, stating as to the aggregate amount of contracts to be made, that payments shall not exceed the amounts approved by the appropriation acts. So a duty is placed on the Appropriations Committee. This matter has been ruled upon, and ruled upon before, and I ask that the point of order be not sustained.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order on line 12, which reads "in any fiscal year." Is it in order to make that point now, or should it be made at the conclusion of the Chair's ruling?

The CHAIRMAN. It can be made now. The Chair will rule on both points of order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on line 12, page 12, to the words "any fiscal year," on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriation bill which binds the appropriations for all future times.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the language in this section is the same as in the bill last year. The only difference is the amount of money. The language is identical.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the point or order I made, while it is true, as the chairman of the subcommittee said, that the point of order to all the language was overruled, I do not think a point of order was made to the language that I have brought forward, and I believe it is a different point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I accept the inclusion of the point of order by the gentleman from Illinois, and under the terms of Hinds' Precedents, my point of order is raised against the entire section and I would include the point made by the gentleman from Illinois against the entire section.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair will pass on both points of order at this moment, and the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the decision of the Chair on H.R. 11588, a bill providing for supplemental appropriations, on the 14th of October 1965, did include language identical to that subject to the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin and identical to that subject to the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois. At that time both points of order were ruled upon by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Harris, of Arkansas. He ruled that the proviso constituted a limitation negative in nature that did not impose additional duties upon the administration and overruled the point of order on both points.

The Chair, on the basis of the ruling of the Chairman on the 14th of October 1965, referred to, overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 4, strike out lines 6 through 22, inclusive.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I doubt that I shall take the 5 minutes allotted to me on this, because it has been discussed quite at length, but I would assume there are many others who will want to discuss the question of the rent subsidy bill. I think we should consider this for exactly what it is.

Now, let us stop talking about $12 million. This is not $12 million. It is, in fact, $480 million, because the subsidy runs for a 40-year period. But if the current authorization is funded, we will reach $150 million by the fourth year, which will result in a $6 billion program over the 40-year period. So what we are starting in this supplemental bill today is a new program of $6 billion and at a time when we are on the eve of inflation and faced with a fiscal situation of not knowing exactly what is going to be needed for requirements in Vietnam. It would seem to me this is a good time to vote this program down and not fund it and get it underway. Until we find out what is going to happen in the funding of Vietnam or whether we are going to have continued increases in the cost of living, we should not fund this. With the increase in the cost of living shown today we will have an increase of probably 6 percent in a year. How many of these new programs are we going to embark on which are constantly eroding the fiscal situation in our country today?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get the gentleman's interpretation of the words to which I made a point of order in view of the fact that he has called this a multibillion-dollar program. These are the words that appear on line 12 of page 4, "in any fiscal year."

I understand that language seeks to bind for the foreseeable future, in using the words "in any fiscal year" the program to a limitation of $12 million. How then does the gentleman make a multibillion-dollar program out of it?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman knows very well that next year this can be changed. This reminds me of what we are talking about here today and how everybody is so happy about the regulations today. They have made some changes in the regulations. Last year we defeated this because of the regulations. Now everybody is happy and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY], and others are happy because the regulations have been changed. I do not know whether they are not going to be changed tomorrow morning after we fund it back to what we had last year.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Even if the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], had been sustained and the words "in any fiscal year" had been stricken, it would still have had $12 million in contract authorizations per year for 40 years, which makes $480 million.

Mr. BOW. That is the point I made originally. It was $480 million.

Now I wish to yield to my delightful friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. May I remind my colleagues that we are not talking about regulations only but are writing these standards into the law. So the regulations which you suggest may be changed will not be changed next year. I suggest that the thing to do is defeat the gentleman's amendment and these regulations, limitations, and standards will be written into the law.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In reply to my statement, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] said that even at the rate of $12 million this totals up to a program of $480 million. As I understood the gentleman's original statement, he pointed to a program of $6 billion.

Mr. BOW. No. If the gentleman was listening carefully—and I am sure he does at times——

Mr. YATES. I always listen attentively to the gentleman's words.

Mr. BOW. I am afrad he was not, because the first thing I said was we should stop talking about a $12 million program, for it is in fact a $480 million program, since it is a program for 40 years. Then I said if the current authorization is funded, we will reach $150 million in the fourth year, which results in a $6 billion program over 40 years. I am sure I cleared it up in the gentleman's mind. Now let us give some of our other colleagues an opportunity.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today one of the most important pieces of domestic legislation which will be enacted by this Congress this year. The dollar amount involved is relatively small, but the principle it represents is fundamentally important. Our vote today will decide whether or not we will make a reality of our long-sought goal of enlisting private initiative to the

fullest extent in our efforts to provide decent housing for low-income families.

And that is exactly what the rent supplement program is all about.

Last year the Congress authorized the rent supplement program to enable private nonprofit and limited dividend corporations and cooperatives to sponsor housing projects for low-income families with the Government making up the difference between what these families could afford to pay out of their meager incomes and the regular economic rent. This housing will be privately sponsored, privately financed and privately owned. The housing must be of modest design and the cost limitations announced by the Department are actually lower than those for regular public housing.

The families who live in them will be those with incomes no higher than public housing limits and the Department has announced very conservative limitations for family assets. For families generally, no more than $2,000 in assets will be allowed while for the elderly, in recognition of their special needs, the limitation will be $5,000. This is well below the asset limitation generally applied in regular public housing. In addition, only those who are elderly or handicapped, displaced by government action, now living in substandard housing, or who are the victims of a natural disaster will be eligible. Certainly no one questions the fact that these families need aid. In fact, every family eligible for rent supplement would be eligible for public housing in any case, but what we are doing with this program is enabling private sponsors to offer their services.

It is clear from this that the rent supplement program is even more conservative than the existing public housing program. Not only must families be within the public housing range but the limitation on assets which a family can have and still be eligible will be generally more restrictive than now imposed under public housing. In addition, only those low-income families who fall into one or more of the five categories I have just mentioned will be eligible. This will assure that the program will meet the most urgent housing problems facing us. For example, we are all familiar with the serious housing problem facing so many of our senior citizens. Their incomes in general are very low and their housing needs are also special. All too few dwelling units are now available that take into account their present and potential physical needs as well as their need for a congenial environment.

In 1959 we made an important forward step toward meeting this problem by the enactment of the senior citizens housing loan program which provides for 3 percent financing for this kind of housing. However, it is clear that something more is needed, particularly for senior citizens of lowest income whose only alternative now is public housing or slum housing. The flexibility in establishing rents under the rent supplement program will enable us to take care of a much wider range of our senior citizens so that they can live their lives in relative comfort. Already over 400 applications from nonprofit groups and cooperatives have applied for these loans representing churches, unions, civic groups, fraternal organizations, and the like. These are the kinds of groups who are ready, willing and able to make the benefit of rent supplements available to the elderly.

Much the same problem confronts victims of physical handicaps who need some special consideration in the design and location of their housing and whose incomes are limited as a result of their misfortune. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], who is a member of the Housing Subcommittee led the fight to give recognition to the problems of the handicapped in our existing programs and I am sure he will agree that the rent supplement program would be a most important further step in meeting their needs.

The next category of eligible families—those displaced by urban renewal or other federally aided construction—is one which holds a high claim for help in meeting their housing needs. I was most pleased to support the amendment offered by the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], which was included in last year's act to give equitable treatment to displacees. However, to fully live up to that commitment I feel we should make every effort to assure that decent housing is available to these people at rents which they can afford and the rent supplement program will do just that.

Another group who would be eligible for rent supplements are those low income families who are now living in slum housing. It is true that these families would be eligible for regular public housing but we all know that there simply is not enough public housing to meet this need and that there are some 800,000 families in this, the richest country the world has ever known, who are on waiting lists to get into public housing. There are also many more who are discouraged from ever applying because the lists are so long and there are those who for one reason or another do not want to live in public housing. Many of these families are now paying exorbitant rents for delapidated, overcrowded, rat-infested slum housing because they have no other choice. We can never eliminate slums unless we provide additional housing within the means of these families so that they can share in the dream of America and have clean and decent homes and neighborhoods in which to live and raise their children.

Finally, those whose homes have been destroyed by a natural disaster would be eligible for rent supplements. Those who have seen the devastation brought by floods or hurricanes such as the destructive storm which swept Louisiana last fall know the plight of these people whose homes are gone with everything in them. Many of these families find themselves destitute and often deeply in debt. For these stricken families who fall within the income and asset limitations, rent supplement housing can be a godsend to help them get back on their feet.

When the appropriation request came before the House last fall, there was some criticism of the tentative regulations then available and the Congress directed that further study be made by the Department and funds were appropriated for that purpose. That study has been made and the new regulations, I believe, meet every objection that was voiced at that time. The income ceilings have been nailed down at the public housing limits or even lower, the asset limitations have been cut to public housing limits or even lower—not more than $2,000 generally and no more than $5,000 in the case of the elderly, and the construction cost ceiling has been set below public housing limits. Certainly, these changes fully answer the main points that bothered some Members last year.

The rent supplement program has unusually broad support. When the bill first came up for a vote last year, it was endorsed by unions, senior citizens groups, churches, civic groups and others including the National Association of Home Builders, which ranked it very high on its list of priorities.

Now we have important support from a new quarter. The National Association of Real Estate Boards which opposed the bill last year, has reexamined its position and now wholeheartedly endorses the program. I feel that this is particularly commendable and it is a measure of the real stature of that organization that it is willing to reexamine its position and is not afraid to change its mind if it feels the facts justify a change. With this kind of support I do not see how the House could fail to approve the modest appropriation before us today.

Personally, I regret that only $12 million was recommended and I had hoped that the committee would see fit to make the full $30 million authorization available. However, the important thing is to get this program underway. I am confident it will prove its value and continue to gain support as time goes on. I also regret that the committee has attached a rider which imposes an unnecessary administrative burden. Again, however, it is important to make a start as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support the appropriations for the rent supplement program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman's position—he would like to have more money appropriated. There are others who would like to cut it all out. But the gentleman's position is that he is supporting the Committee on Appropriations; is that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes, that is correct. Certainly I am greatly concerned about the appropriation being cut down to $12 million. I was hoping that we could get $30 million. However, the Committee on Appropriations has worked its will, and I believe this House should support the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman made a very important point when he said that the benefits of this act would not be available to all people of low income. As a matter of fact, there are restricted classes who would be able to benefit from this program; is that not correct? And are not the classes those who are displaced by governmental action; second, people who are elderly, third, the physically handicapped; fourth, those who live in substandard housing; fifth, those who occupy or did occupy housing which is destroyed or extensively damaged by a natural disaster?

Are those not the classes of people who are the only ones to qualify—the only classes of people of low income who would qualify for the benefits of this program?

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted it would really strike at the small margin which is aimed at the start of promising efforts to provide decent housing for our most underprivileged citizens, and to provide medical benefits for the elderly as well as to provide educational benefits, where most urgently needed, in urban and rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, those who vote for this amendment forgot to realize just what this amendment constitutes and what the results will be. It will hit the most deserving people among the American community.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman from Massachusetts is right. May I add this: It was stated here earlier that public housing makes it unnecessary to fund this program to house the people who are in dire need for decent, safe and sanitary housing. The gentleman failed to tell the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union here today that the Public Housing Authority over the last 30 years—three decades— has been able to build only 718,000 units. Today, we have a backlog of 500,000 waiting now to enter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBSTEIN

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEIN: On page 4, line 14, strike out "$12,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000,000".

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York since the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is pending.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is a perfecting amendment to the paragraph, which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio would completely strike out. Since the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is a perfecting amendment, it is in order.

The gentleman from New York is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate and it occurs to me that if the law were amended to read $30 million over a period of 40 years, it would total $1,200 million. Now what is so terrible about $1,200 million being spent over 40 years to enable the poor and the underprivileged to live in decent housing?

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the gentleman the Department is asking for $35 million for the 1967 fiscal year in the regular budget, which we are taking up this very week. The subcommittee thought that $12 million for the balance of the 1966 fiscal year in a supplemental appropriation was not unreasonable. In other words, the Department feels it can only contract for and obligate $35 million in fiscal year 1967 so it did not make sense to us to give $30 million in a supplemental budget for the fiscal year 1966.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I must say it makes sense to me.

Mr. GIAIMO. It would make sense if they could use that much money and obligate it. But we cannot just shove money at them which they cannot properly obligate and make contracts with.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Well, let the housing authority worry about that.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Is it not better and is it not more beneficial to those who need decent, safe, and sanitary housing to get this program moving? I would want $30 million but the committee has worked its will and the committee has decided that $12 million will be given for this period of time in the fiscal year on this program. So why not take the $12 million and follow the wishes of the committee and cooperate with the committee.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am satisfied to take the $12 million if I cannot get the $30 million. But first I want to try to get the $30 million and I want to give the Members of the House the opportunity to express their views on that and to let the House work its will on the question of whether they want the $30 million or the $12 million.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase the appropriation for rent supplements from $12 to $30 million, which the President originally requested.

I have listened to the debate this afternoon and am convinced now more than ever that the supplemental rent program is needed, but in the amount of $30 million.

If we can spend $4 billion for a farm program, why not $30 million for this program?

In the large cities we have an admitted housing shortage and cannot obtain sufficient funds for low-cost public housing. Then why not permit church groups, labor groups, cooperatives, and limited-dividend housing groups to build for low-income people—for the underprivileged.

Private housing is constantly being demolished for roads and other public purposes. Yet no adequate replacements are built. What is to happen to these displaced families? I contend that not alone is $12 million a mere pittance, but that even the $30 million called for by my substitute amendment is inadequate. At least it will be a halfway decent start.

Rent supplements will also allow low-income tenants to live among middle-income people in better homes. We hope it will give them the incentive to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. They will be able to upgrade their living habits. When their income increases and they are no longer eligible for low-income apartments, families will not be dispossessed, but will be given the opportunity to live in the same apartments without a subsidy.

Despite the cost limitations which will be placed upon the construction of rent supplement housing, it can be built and be helpful in the large cities in the country. We have State laws which permit municipalities to allow tax abatement for housing available to people of limited income. We also have many urban renewal sites that can be utilized for such housing. Both of these factors will be helpful in building nonprofit limited-dividend or cooperative housing under the rent supplement program in New York City. Certainly, it will be possible to build many of the efficiency and one-bedroom units that will be required for elderly people now living in substandard housing.

Another large potential for rent supplement program activity in New York City lies in the rehabilitation of thousands of older tenements. Many of these structures which have been in existence for 50 or 60 years can remain standing another 50 or 60 years, but they need a great deal of modernization. They need new plumbing facilities; they need new ventilation; they need redesigning of interiors. With all of this required work, these older structures will still be able to produce housing at relatively low costs. Substantial rehabilitation projects of this type could be carried out under the rent supplement program.

Such a plan would alleviate the search for available land sites—a problem which has plagued many would-be public housing and moderate-income housing projects in New York City. We could utilize the existing sound structures but make them more livable, and with rent supplements make them available to the low-income people who cannot otherwise obtain standard housing. I hope the amendment prevails.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday my wonderful friend and our beloved Speaker chided me and those of us on our side of the aisle because he

felt that we lacked vision. The Speaker made this allegation inasmuch as we on our side of the aisle were nearly unanimously going to oppose the rent supplemental program in this bill today.

Naturally, I disagree with the distinguished Speaker in his allegation. I respond by saying that it seems to me the vision of my Democratic friends, or a substantial number of them today, is blurred a bit by some unwarranted rose-colored glasses. May I add, on this particular issue I think they are looking a little cross-eyed.

We on our side are looking at the cold, hard realities of the merits or the lack of them, and are looking at a drastic change in circumstances between last October and today, both fiscally speaking and from the point of view of inflation.

Some very strange things are going on in the Nation's Capital today. I have in my hand here a statement from the UPI to the effect that President Johnson is trying to cool off the business investment boom, that the White House would be pleased if businessmen go slow in investment at this time.

As we all know, a few weeks ago the Secretary of Defense arbitrarily withheld funds for the construction of 8,500 military housing units. I am told that the President has been conversing with State and local authorities urging those governmental units to hold back their spending and to limit their programs of one sort or another.

It is paradoxical, I think, at the same time to have the White House assistants, headed by Lawrence O'Brien, former administration lobbyist and now Postmaster General, weaving in and out of the various House Office Buildings urging Democrats to stick with President Johnson's request for funds for the rent supplement program. I am confused with the administration wanting business, the military, and State and local agencies to cut back on their spending and, on the other hand, the President urges the Congress to authorize at least a $480 million rent subsidy program here this afternoon.

Then I had called to my attention just a few moments ago a statement from the ticker which reads as follows:

President Johnson indicated today he may ask Congress to increase taxes by $5 billion more or less perhaps as early as next month if prices increase.

Let me say this. This amendment and the debate today has put the spotlight on the problem of inflation, on taxes, in addition to the basic issue of whether this whole rent subsidy program has merit or not.

First, let me say a word or two about the rent subsidy program itself. Congress in the last session did approve the the authorization bill for rent subsidies by a narrow margin of 4 votes in the House. Later the funds were disallowed on a rollcall vote. The principal reason for the adverse attitude of the Congress, for the narrow vote on the authorization and the subsequent defeat of the funds, was the unrealistic ceilings on income and on outside assets.

The original proposal from the White House, what really is in the heart of the people who propose it, was an income limitation of $11,000 and outside assets of approximately $25,000. They finally retreated from that and went back to a figure of $8,000-plus for an income limitation and $24,000 in outside assets.

Now we are told these limitations will be imposed by executive action. Is this sufficient assurance for a program of this magnitude?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have no faith, none whatesoever, in these proposed or existing regulations. May I make a point? I fail to understand why Congress has so much faith in nonexistent regulations that supposedly insure that this program will benefit truly low-income families.

In 1961 we were told the very same thing about the below market interest rate program, the so-called section 221(d)(3) housing program. On this very floor, we were assured that this program would replace public housing. We were assured that if only the Congress would trust the people in the housing agency, regulations would be so written and so enforced.

Today, 5 years and several hundred million dollars later, the regulations governing this program make a mockery of these promises. In New York, a family with three children can earn $9,450 and still qualify for this indirect subsidy of approximately $30 per month.

What I am saying is, when you approve this program today—if we do, and I hope we do not—in effect we are giving contract authorization for 40 years, committing Congresses up to the year 2006 at a figure of at least $12 million per year. I do not think the Congress today should take such action.

But let me say a word about the problem of those who voted for the authorization or the appropriations in 1965. The circumstances today in two areas have changed dramatically and would fully justify anybody who voted for the authorization or for the appropriation last year to change his position.

The President directly and otherwise has conceded that this country today is in the throws of swirling inflation. The President in his economic message has said that inflation is the most unjust and capricious form of taxation.

What are the facts concerning inflation? About 10 days ago the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that we had a 0.7-percent increase in the wholesale price index in the month of February, the biggest jump in 12 years. If you annualize this 0.7-percent increase, the total increase in the wholesale price index in a 12-month period will be over 6 percent. Furthermore, this morning, the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that in the month of February we had a 0.5-percent increase in the cost of living. If you annualize this, it is a 6-percent increase in a 12-month period. And we have had a 1.5-percent increase in the cost of living since last October.

To conclude, let me say this on this point: The United States today is in the midst of wartime inflation. We are suffering a wartime increase in the cost of living. In this crisis, the Congress has a responsibilty to cut back and hold the line of domestic spending. Those who do vote for rent supplements are in effect voting for a tax increase, which the President says he will send to us within the next month. Those who vote for rent subsidies today are voting for added inflation across the board.

One more point on the budget: In October of last year, it was anticipated that we were to have a budget deficit for fiscal year 1966 of $5,300 million. The January forecast was a deficit this fiscal year of $6.4 billion. We really know that deficit will be close to $8 billion on June 30.

If we take the President's budget for fiscal year 1967, and if we take his supplementals for fiscal year 1966, in effect we are voting for higher prices, higher taxes, higher deficits, higher costs. The Great Society will be the High Society.

We will have to meet that challenge in the political arena in 1966.

You will have to meet that challenge in the political arena in 1966.

Mr. Chairman, on the merits, because of inflation, because of taxes, because of the deteriorating fiscal situation, we must approve the Bow amendment to strike rent subsidies from this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat chagrined at the appellation my distinguished friend used in describing those of us on this side of the aisle. He said we are cross eyed. But I think an examination of the record will disclose that most of my friends on the other side have been blind for 35 years. They have only elected two Congresses in all that time. They have been blind in their opposition to progressive legislation; blind in their concern for human beings; blind to the significance of the era in which we live.

I think this proposal for a modest amount for rent supplements is a very significant and important part of this appropriation bill though not particularly significant in size. I think my friends on the other side just refuse to change. Every time the Democrats in Congress try to do something for the American people they oppose. They have been opposing year in and year out. It used to be the depression. We could not afford it, they said. Then it was something else. Then it was the Korean war. Now it is the Vietnamese war. Then it is inflation. In the 1912 campaign Woodrow Wilson said that the Republican Party had not learned a thing in 40 years. That was 44 years ago, making 84 years in all.

I think we are just as opposed to inflation as anyone else, but we do not run

for cover every time the word is mentioned. Last month our friends were talking about guns or butter. Do I see my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. LAIRD], here? He changed that, after the speaker had taken him on, to rifles or ruffles.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. LAIRD. I did not develop this guns or butter issue and never referred to it as such—this our distinguished speaker knows full well.

It was developed as far back as the time of the Civil War that this descriptive slogan was used. But, representing a district in the Congress which produces more milk and cheese than any other district, I would rather use other terms. However, the administration has now taken the butter away from our serviceman and is now using substitutes not only for butter but for many other items in the conduct of the war and in the outfitting of our troops.

Mr. ALBERT. I did not accuse the gentleman of originating that idea. He joined the Speaker in abandoning it. I think the gentleman will find himself now, if he adopts the slogan of rifles or ruffles, to be taking on the women of the country or the garment manufacturers of the country or both. I am sure my Republican friend would not want to do that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. As one from a consumer State which produces very little milk and butter, although of the highest possible quality, I might point out that margarine has great benefits, especially if one worries about cholesterol. They should start taking some of the fat out of their talk and some of the fat out of their butter, and then they might do better.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the rent supplement program which we are considering today will give new vitality to our efforts to provide decent housing for the poor. There is a need for this legislation. There are some 500,000 names on waiting lists for public housing throughout the country. There are another 4.5 million people whose low incomes keep them out of standard, decent housing, which I think is the goal of each of us. Last year we enacted legislation to authorize a rent supplement program. Unless we appropriate funds to make this program workable, the entire concept of a decent home for American families becomes a shallow promise. We can shut our eyes if we choose to do so.

But, Mr. Chairman, this state of life without hope is a real thing in too many American cities. And it is a dangerous thing in every American city in which it exists.

It contributed to the rioting in Watts, and it can explode into rioting and civil disorder in many great cities in the land.

We must act positively to eliminate one of the basic causes of unrest by helping our poverty-stricken families get better and more decent housing.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it, we are talking about poor people. This program is restricted to families whose income would make them eligible for public housing, and it is limited to five specific categories. In addition to that—and may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], who has looked upon this as so much window dressing—what we have said about this today is a part of the legislative history of this appropriation act. This is, in a sense, a directive to the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. And may I say that when the Department comes back next year this Congress will still control the funding and this Congress will have the last look in any case.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Michigan, but I must go on.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman concedes, of course, that these limits are not a matter of law; they can be changed tomorrow, they can be changed next week. I am sure the gentleman would also admit that agencies of the Federal Government over the years on many occasions have totally disregarded directives from the Congress. They have toally disregarded legislative history that we have made on the floor of the House. So I have no faith in their decisions.

Mr. ALBERT. I can say to the gentleman that this is a part of the legislative history.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that Congress will have the last word when it considers the regular appropriation bill, within the next few months, and when it considers additional appropriations hereafter.

The program is geared to private enterprise, and will at last allow the private sector of the economy to attack the problem of providing homes for low-income families.

Funds to finance the projects will come from regular private mortgage markets. The projects will be built by private builders. Mortgages will be insured by the Federal Housing Administration at a market rate of interest and the only Federal funds involved will be for the supplement itself. The rent supplement itself will in time, we hope, take the place of the supplement which the Federal Government is furnishing to those who occupy public housing units.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT], circulated a letter yesterday in which he attached an article from Reader's Digest which purports to deal with FHA procedures and practices. I have read the article. In my opinion it is without perspective, and we would be without vision if we were to follow the Lorelei call away from a program that would help our poor.

Mr. Chairman, through the Federal Housing Administration we have become a nation of homeowners. More than 1 million units of rental housing have been produced. The agency's total volume is over $100 billion, and the agency has been a moneymaking agency for the Federal Government. While I do not condone impropriety or malpractice, I believe that articles such as this should be considered against the total activity of this agency. The question we have before us is whether or not we will help the poor people of our country and if we want to offer private enterprise an opportunity to do the job. If the Republicans fear inflation, why do they not jump on larger programs in this bill instead of this modest appropriation for the poorest people in our land?

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this only for the purpose of asking my good friend, the majority leader, a question. The gentleman a moment ago mentioned that the Republicans were constantly referring to inflation.

Mr. ALBERT. Referring to what?

Mr. ARENDS. Referring to inflation—using the word "inflation" too much—that Republicans were constantly using the word "inflation."

Mr. ALBERT. That is not the only cliché that the Republicans use, and that is the way the word is being used by them today, in my opinion.

Mr. ARENDS. I just want to state to the gentleman that what prompts me to take the floor at this particular moment is what recently took place before the Armed Services Committee and on this matter I would ask the gentleman's attention.

When Mr. Vance, Assistant Secretary of Defense, stated before our committee that he had determined along with Secretary of Defense McNamara, that there should not now be any additional military housing provided in this country—because of what?—because of inflation pressures. Those were his words—not my words. If we are going to deny servicemen housing because of inflation pressures we had better take a good look now at what is being proposed to be done in the legislation presently under consideration.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. You do not have to quote Mr. Vance. All you have to do is to go back to December and recall what Mr. McNamara said as the reason for deferring the construction of the 8,500 units of military family housing. He took the responsibility—a Cabinet officer—of freezing the money that we appropriated last year to build 8,500 houses for the families of servicemen at military installations in the United States. He stated the reason he was doing that was not because the housing was not needed—oh, no—it was because of the increased requirement for additional spending to finance the war in Vietnam. He said, in effect, that the time had come to do without some things that we can

postpone while we have this increased obligation to finance the war in Vietnam. I have heard people here today say that those who would receive rent subsidies should not be the only ones to make sacrifices. I would say that the servicemen and their families should not be the only ones called upon to make sacrifices. If we can do without the military family housing that was justified before our committee last year as being absolutely necessary to keep these military families from living in substandard housing—if we can do without that in the interest of providing funds to take care of the war in Vietnam and curb inflation, I think we can postpone this program also.

Mr. ARENDS. I will simply say to the gentleman from North Carolina that he is absolutely correct in what he has said. Not only has Congress authorized but we have likewise appropriated money for military housing and it has come to a dead stop because Secretary Vance is the man who stated before our committee that he in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, without regard to the budget and without reference to the administration, had determined on their own, had reached their own conclusion that there should be no military housing in this country because of inflationary pressures.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I yielded to several other Members and did not get time to discuss the question of inflation and the consumer price index, which matter was raised by my distinguished friend, the minority leader.

Mr. Chairman, the one-half percent rise in the Consumer Price Index for February, announced today, has led some to conclude that inflation is already here, and that something must be done about it right now.

I have no wish to minimize either the dangers of inflation or its evils. Nor would I dispute for a moment the need for our national economic policies to be adjusted promptly to whatever extent would be required to prevent a new inflationary spiral from getting started. We have had enough experience with inflation to want no part of it. But we must not jump to conclusions without weighing the evidence.

The Consumer Price Index reflects the average impact of price changes on the average family. But the month-to-month movements of that index do not furnish a reliable indicator of the pressure on prices. In December the index rose appreciably; in January it did not move at all. Did anyone conclude last month when the January index appeared that the danger of inflation had disappeared? There is no more reason to use the rise in February to conclude that inflation has suddenly arrived.

The February increase in consumer prices was almost entirely due to increases in prices of food and services. Service prices have been rising for a long time—largely because productivity does not grow very rapidly in some major kinds of services, and because we cannot fully and truly measure the improved quality of such services as medical care. Whatever the cause, the February increase in service prices is nothing new. And it has little to do with general economic conditions or the proper direction of economic policy.

Food prices rose 1.5 percent from January to February, accounting for about three-fourths of the total increase. Neither can we judge the state of the economy from that change.

The rise in food prices in the past few months mainly reflects temporary changes in the supply of farm products—particularly a reduced supply of pork, which also has affected prices of beef and poultry. Does anyone contend that this Nation does not have adequate power to produce—at stable costs and prices—all the food we can use, and to have enough left over to ease the burdens of hunger around the world?

Moreover, the February index reflcts a situation which has already changed distinctly for the better. Prices for food on the farm have already begun to ease off. Since mid-February, hog prices have declined 13 percent, butter prices have receded from their peak, and many other food prices already have or are now expected to level off or decline. None of these events is reflected in the February index. It will take a month or two before they are fully reflected. But we should not let ourselves be panicked by statistics which do not reflect the current situation. The February index is past history.

Far more significant than prices of services or food, as an indicator of the pressure on prices in our economy, is what is happening to nonfood commodity prices. They rose exactly 0.1 percent in February.

That increase, at the rate of 1.2 percent a year, is only a little faster than the 0.9 percent increase of 1964—when no one was talking about inflation.

There is more pressure on prices in 1966 than in earlier years. That is only to be expected when output is increasing rapidly. To have achieved an unemployment rate of 3.7 percent with so small an increase in the basic level of costs and prices is a remarkable feat. It shows how much latent productive power our economy possessed. It shows that those who make price and wage decisions are taking their responsibility for the national interest seriously. And it also reflects the efforts of the President and his administration to remove bottlenecks in supplies of materials and manpower.

Now that we have finally achieved a high level of employment and of capacity utilization, we must proceed with care not to overtax our economy. We must watch every aspect of the economy to judge whether the balance between supply and demand has been upset. But the Consumer Price Index is only one of many indicators—and it does not give reliable signals for action. We must wait until the returns are all in before we judge whether more restraint is needed.

And in reaching that judgment we must be conscious of the forces of restraint that have already been set in motion. Last December's tightening of monetary policy is only now beginning to work its way through our economic system. The $6 billion payroll tax increase effective last January will make its effects felt with some lag. And the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 is yet to come into effect.

If further restraint is necessary, I for one will support it. But what happened to food prices in February is of little use at the end of March in deciding whether we need restraint now.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am certain that the argument we are hearing here this afternoon will be heard for the rest of this session. As a matter of fact, I am informed that another amendment will be offered when the pending amendment is disposed of. I hope the pending amendment will be voted down. Another amendment, I understand, will be offered to strike the provision in this bill which provides for the Teacher Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the argument here is whether or not this country, the greatest Nation on earth, must now turn back—must now limit all of its activities at home that involve our people in so many aspects of their daily lives—whether we must, as I say, now turn back and limit our efforts along these lines because of the commitments we have to defend freedom elsewhere in this world.

That is what the argument is about.

Our friends here in the Republican Party are not really being inconsistent, as the distinguished majority leader pointed out a moment ago. For one reason or another during the past generation or two they have managed to find an excuse for opposing most of the constructive and progressive legislation proposed since the turn of the century.

The record, of course, speaks for itself. I can cite them one after another: Social security back in 1935. I do not know how many Republian votes there were for social security, perhaps 10. It has been that way throughout the years.

What are the issues as we see them on our side of the aisle? A party which has sought to respond to the needs of our people at home and to the challenges of our country abroad.

No. 1, we reject the notion that we live in a static society. The Republican notion seems to be is that everything must remain the same for now. We know that we have to move ahead. We have to move forward. Can we afford to move ahead now and still maintain our commitments abroad?

Let us look at the base from which we operate. Back in 1941, when we entered World War II, we had a gross national product of a little over $100 billion. We had inherited a depression from the great Republican administration that preceded Franklin Roosevelt. It took us a long time to get back production in our country. We had 14 percent of our people unemployed for many years. We had a depression, a recession, dc-

spondency, and the loss of hope all over our Nation.

But we fought a war with a base of of about one-seventh of what we have now.

In 1950, when we went into Korea, we had a gross national product of a little more than $200 billion. Now with our commitment in Vietnam we have a gross national product approaching $725 billion.

Vietnam, under present estimates, requires about 2 percent of that gross national product, compared to a much larger percentage in 1950 and a much, much larger percentage in 1941, and the early 1940's and, of course, a much greater percentage back in 1918.

So what we are debating here is whether or not, with this kind of national wealth, we can afford to continue in a modest fashion with some programs that my good friends over here have opposed all along. They are being consistent. I am not being critical.

But I maintain, members of the Committee, that we cannot afford to do otherwise. The distinguished majority leader gave you some figures as of today, just a moment ago. They will be elaborated upon in the record as it is built here this afternoon. The Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee dealt with these matters in detail in the report just filed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. The cost of food, the biggest item in the budget of the average family in our country today, is less, percentagewise, than it has ever been. It is about 18 percent of what the average family earns. This is less than it has ever been in the United States, and it is by far the least of any nation on God's green earth. Nevertheless, we are still concerned about the cost of food and every effort is being made to prevent increases.

Let us look at some of the other factors. Would we curb inflation if we cut back on this modest program, if we did not adopt this program, if we did not adopt the Teachers Corps? Would eliminating this $12 million stop inflation? Or would it not send forth the message that we had put the brakes on developing our own society at home because we did not have faith in our capacity and in our people?

We talk about our men in Vietnam. Are we say to those who come from the poorer families, "No, we shan't do anything for your folks back home. Let them live in the slums. Let them remain there while you fight in Vietnam."

Do we say to the young men who need education, "No, we must hole up. We cannot appropriate funds now for education because we are committed in Vietnam"?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I have just a minute, but I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I just wonder how the men in Vietnam feel when their families are not housed at home, and how we justify this affluent society.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman makes a very good point. That is exactly the point I am making here. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Now, let me go ahead.

We are growing, whether we like it or not, at a rate of about 4 million a year—4 million new Americans. That is about the population in my State. It is more than the population of many States in this Union.

We cannot be a static society. We have to face up to these problems. We cannot fall for the argument now being advanced by people who have traditionally, historically, consistently opposed constructive programs now that they find a more convenient weapon, a more convenient slogan to tie their time-honored opposition to.

I appeal to my Democratic friends who believe in this country to support these programs.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the distinguished majority leader talk to us about the problems of the poor, the infirm, the disabled, the retired, and how these 18,000 units that we are discussing here today have a major effect upon the poor, the infirm, the disabled, and the retired.

This question of inflation, he says, is a cliche, but what he fails to mention is that this "cliche" has a very real effect on millions of Americans from one end of this country to the other. It has an effect because it comes close to their homes and their food and their rent and everything they do.

We have before us the President's budget for 1967. In the revenue estimate in this budget, it is clear the President himself anticipates a cost of living increase of 3 percent. Most of the top economists in this country think that these revenue estimates, which are based upon a cost of living increase of 3 percent during fiscal year 1967, have been overestimated.

What happened today? Another one-half of 1 percent increase in the cost of living has been announced. You know what has happened in each of the weeks since January: one-tenth of 1 percent increase in the wholesale price index every week during January; almost two-tenths of 1 percent each week during the month of February. The wholesale price index is moving at a more rapid rate than it has at any time during the last 9 years.

Yes, inflation is the same as the levy of a national sales tax on every single individual in America. The national sales tax levied, because of the fiscal, monetary and other policies of our Federal Government in the last 12 months, has amounted to some 2½ percent, and it will be more than 3 percent in fiscal year 1967, making a total assured national sales tax of over 5.5 percent during the term of this 89th Congress alone.

Mr. Chairman, there are many programs in the domestic budget of the President that are desirable. But are they necessary at this time? The distinguished majority leader wondered why we take this one program in this one amendment today. Under the parliamentary procedure that we face here in the House of Representatives, it is necessary for us to take these items one by one.

I can assure the majority leader that there will be other amendments considered during this session of Congress in an effort to dramatize this spending issue.

We are going to be faced with a tax bill in the latter part of this session. All we have to do is look at the wire service reports today, and those who are serving on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee know full well, from the classified testimony before that committee, that the defense estimates for 1967 are not realistic as far as expenditures are concerned. They know full well that the Defense Department's manpower ceiling, as far as the Department of the Army is concerned, was outdated 2 days after the budget was submitted to this Congress. They know that when that manpower ceiling was lifted for the Department of the Army, it meant an additional billion dollars, at least, in that one appropriation item alone.

We on this side of the aisle ask why is not that supplemental, why is not that budget amendment here for us to see now while we are working on some domestic programs that many feel are desirable but that every Member of this body knows are not entirely necessary at this time.

If the last session of Congress is any guide, and it appears here today that it is a very good guide, this administration again hopes to see this Congress pass all of these domestic appropriation items and then, just as last year, we will find on our doorstep supplemental after supplemental to finance the cost of the national security of our country. With more than 235,000 American servicemen in Vietnam today and with prospects of hundreds of thousands more before the end of fiscal year 1967, we seem to be misplacing our concern of what should come first in our consideration and concern.

Mr. Chairman, we in the minority—especially when the majority seems to abrogate its obligations—have a responsibility to have a confrontation of ideas so as to debate this issue here in the Congress of the United States so the people of this country will know it is not the farmer, it is not the laboring man, it is not the housewife, and it is not the businessman that is responsible for this inflation we are experiencing today.

Inflation has never been referred to in my vocabulary as any kind of a "cliche." It refers to the cost of living, to the purchasing power of the dollar.

You cannot blame the farmer, you cannot blame the businessman, you cannot blame anyone else. The responsibility rests with us in Congress because of the fiscal policies of our Federal Government.

So, when the majority leader asks us why do we take this amendment first, I say that we are starting a program here

which is a 40-year program and which will cost some $6 billion but that affects only 18,000 individuals. However, inflation in the cost of living affects 190 million people. Let us remember that as we vote on each of these amendments as they come up throughout the year.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much emotion here and I hope I will be pardoned if perhaps I become emotional, too. I heard a great cheer go up from one part of this House when it was mentioned that we have not provided funds for the families of servicemen at camps but we are coming in here and asking for this money. Somebody else asked, Is this necessary?

I would remind you that our servicemen were civilians yesterday. Their elderly mothers and fathers, for whom this type of legislation is enacted, are living in the slums. I wonder what you think their morale is when they know they are laying their lives on the line in Vietnam and an ungrateful nation back home does nothing for their families and consigns them to live in stinking holes. I would ask you gentlemen some day to go to the homes of some of these young men who are now in Vietnam. I went to the home of one not long ago. When I walked into that home I realized we had dishonored that boy. There are many boys who will be on the casualty lists whose parents will be mourning for them in pigpens and hovels.

So, if you ask me is this type of bill necessary, I say to you, you bet your life it is. It is one of the most necessary things we will consider in this session of Congress.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. If the gentleman's argument has logic, then why, if we have 270,00 men in Vietnam, is he not fighting for 270,000 units under this bill instead of only 18,000.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If your argument is consistent, then why did the President, even in his own message, say we cut out this year and next year 8,500 units for military families? I wonder if the gentleman visited some of the places our servicemen have to live in. Should they not have a priority here?

Mr. JOELSON. But this bill covers the aged and the people in substandard housing.

Mr. CEDERBERG. What about the servicemen? If it is important to cut out servicemen, is it not important to defer this program?

Mr. JOELSON. But servicemen are not covered by this act. If you want to broaden it, it is fine with me.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The servicemen will be covered by this act.

Mr. JOELSON. They are not now.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to hear the majority leader and the majority whip refer to this problem of inflation as a cliche and relate it to the Republicans. This is not a partisan issue.

President Johnson in his economic message to this Congress——

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe the gentleman from Missouri misunderstood the use of the word "inflation" as being a cliche, and not inflation genuinely.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, all right.

President Johnson used the words in his Economic Report to the Congress—and I believe I can quote them with respect thereto:

> Perhaps inflation will be the most serious issue facing this country this year.

Mr. Chairman, the majority party members of the Joint Economic Committee, including the minority whip, apparently and evidently did not read what the majority said, they certainly said in their report to the Congress just filed within the past 10 days or 2 weeks that, indeed, inflation was a serious matter, and recommended tax increases. Certainly the minority agreed—the minority on the Joint Economic Committee agreed about the seriousness of inflation.

The disagreement occurs because the administration puts tax increases ahead of expenditure cutting.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Did the gentleman from Missouri say that the majority whip [Mr. BOGGS], who just castigated the Republican Party for being concerned about inflation, signed the report of the Economic Committee on which he serves as the gentleman from Missouri has stated, which report states that inflation is a serious problem? Can that be true? Why that is incredible.

Mr. CURTIS. He certainly did; and he made this recommendation. It is a little strange. And it is a little strange, I might say, for this House to be wondering whether or not inflation is with us inasmuch as already this year we have followed the recommendation of the Committee on Ways and Means that we increase taxes. And we did vote the increase in excise taxes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, since he used my name?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman since I did use his name.

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad the gentleman mentioned my name. I might say to the gentleman that I am prepared to do whatever is required to maintain price stability in this country and to combat inflation. But I am not prepared to cut all programs that are needed to help our own country and to help particularly this poor section of our economy. The report of the Joint Economic Committee made that very clear.

The joint economic report——

Mr. CURTIS. No; wait a minute. I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. The report makes that very clear.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is not addressing himself to the point. The point was that the majority whip said that inflation was not a serious matter. The gentleman is now arguing something else, as to what priorities we might exercise in our expenditure policy. This is the area of disagreement. Apparently the administration still is not willing to curtail or set priorities of expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that I took the floor was the amazement I experienced in hearing the leaders of the Democratic Party talk about inflation as if it were not serious, and the majority leader coming down to the well of the House and saying "Oh, well, the consumer price index has just gone up in the area of food."

For Pete's sake, what concerns the people the most if it is not food? That particular item is contained in the Consumer Price Index.

Let me say that the industrial prices just now are going up, and this represents the very area that the administration has been engaged in "jawboning" and using the various stockpiles, illegally, I would say, to try to hold these prices down.

Mr. Chairman, against what are they fighting if it is not this underlying inflation? Of course it is, and it is just putting this debate on the wrong basis to try to persuade the House, the Democrats or the Republicans, that inflation is not a serious matter, a matter that is presently with us.

We probably are going to have to increase taxes again and, probably, we might even have to have controls voted. We will continue to have the price index rise, and for those who are so concerned—and I am a Republican—more about the low-income groups, let me tell you in your own words, because at least your leaders in the economic field say that nothing is more dangerous to the low-income groups than inflation. It hits them the worst and the most.

Mr. Chairman, if you are really concerned about the low-income groups, you will treat inflation with seriousness, and you will not demagog it. It will not go away by referring to it as a Republican cliche.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. STEPHENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I think we ought to get back to some of the basic points in the amendments that have been offered. Let us talk about them for just a minute. Let us talk about the rent supplement program for a few minutes.

I want to bring out six specific points, some of which have been overlooked by the Members of the House in debate.

First of all, we have a rent subsidy now and have had a rent subsidy since the first public housing bill was passed. This is not a new thing to America. That is the first thing.

The second point is that free enterprise is asking for this legislation. They are asking that we pass this legislation. It has been endorsed by the National Home Builders Association, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Georgia Association of Real Estate Boards, the Augusta, Ga., Home Builders Association, and others.

The third point, which has not been brought out, is that in this particular bill no project will be approved unless it has the approval of local officials.

The fourth point that I would call to your attention is that it would be a method to accelerate the building of houses that we are not able to do with public funds by extending the public housing program.

We also know, and this is a point that has not been brought out, that if we accelerate the war in Vietnam, it is not only military housing that is going to have to be provided for people, but also private housing for civilians will have to be built.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think it is quite interesting that at Fort Gordon, which is in the gentleman's State, this is a military installation where the building of barracks is being deferred. I visited Fort Jackson in South Carolina last year during the recess and they were putting up tents there and are deferring the construction of barracks for our military men. I do not think the gentleman is being consistent.

Mr. STEPHENS. I certainly appreciate my colleague calling that to my attention.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am delighted to call it to your attention. Perhaps the gentleman did not realize that that was the situation.

Mr. STEPHENS. Of course, I know Fort Gordon was cut. Evidently, the gentleman has not seen the record of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of which the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] is chairman. I appeared before the subcommittee and made the statement that I wanted to have the military construction program restored. I ask for it now publicly again that it be restored. I did not cut it off. I was not in favor of cutting it off and will vote to put it back.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, I am going to offer an amendment so that none of this money will be spent until this is restored. Then if it is subject to a point of order, some Member on the other side can make a point of order against it.

Mr. STEPHENS. We will get to that question in the proper way after the report from the Subcommittee on Armed Services is made. That is the proper time to put it back in, and not at the present time because it would be merely a red herring across this particular trail.

But I say in all candor, I appeared before the subcommittee and asked that the military construction cut be put back. I think it is a military necessity to do so. I think that to provide civilian housing is also a military necessity.

Now the other point that I want to emphasize about the rent supplement is the fact that only those people who are eligible for public housing anyway will be eligible under the rent supplement program as we have it here.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I must repeat my point of order that the Committee is not in order. This is a most important piece of legislation that we are considering and our colleague is entitled to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order. The gentleman's point of order is well taken. The Committee is not in order. The gentleman from Georgia will suspend until the Committee is in order.

The gentleman from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, let me develop one or two points about the rent-subsidy program.

First of all, when we talked about the housing bill last year not one single protest—not one single word was said about the subsidy that we now have in public housing. I am not opposed to public housing but want free enterprise to take part also.

Let me point out what I mean when I say a subsidy in public housing. I got these figures yesterday in my home community in Athens, Ga. I found out that the persons who are eligible for the housing in public housing were limited by the rule that, if one person had an income of $2,400 or more, that person could not get in.

It has to be $2,400 or under. The maximum is set at $4,500. That maximum is for a family of 10, and it would include five bedrooms.

Under the rental program, one person with $2,400 would get his one-bedroom apartment for $40, and that would include his utilities.

I checked on the private-enterprise scale and I found that not a single privately owned one-bedroom apartment was available in Athens, Ga., at that rental of $40. They rented for $100, and that included utilities. That is the lowest one-room apartment that I could find.

There was one other, and that was a one-bedroom apartment in a private apartment house that rented for $90, and that included the water, but it did not include the rest of the utilities and this would exceed a $100 cost. So there is subsidy already.

This private enterprise approach is to take the $12 million that we are now asking for and to put it into the rental program and let private enterprise put the capital into it.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. What would be the cost to the Federal Government of that $40-per-month apartment in public housing?

Mr. STEPHENS. The cost to the Government is 100 percent, except for the $40 that is paid by the man that is living in the apartment.

Mr. BROCK. What is the net cost?

Mr. STEPHENS. The net cost would be 100 percent less $40.

Mr. BROCK. What amount less $40?

Mr. STEPHENS. The cost.

Mr. BROCK. What is the cost?

Mr. STEPHENS. One hundred percent of the cost, whatever it might be, whether it would be $100,000 or $10,000.

Mr. BROCK. In other words, the gentleman does not know what the cost would be?

Mr. STEPHENS. I do not know what the building cost would be.

Mr. BROCK. It makes a whale of a lot of difference in my opinion.

Mr. STEPHENS. What difference does it make here? The criterion that you are talking about is the cost. Under the public housing program, the cost is paid 100 percent by the Government and under the rent supplement program 100 percent by private enterprise.

I point that out and add that the cost is immaterial. What is important is who is going to pay it? It is material whether the taxpayers of America pay it, certainly. I am asking you to support a program under which the taxpayers are not paying the full 100 percent cost of erecting and conducting public housing but letting private enterprise come into it in the same measure. The only difference is that the U.S. Government is assisting in the rent but not footing the whole bill.

We are proposing the rent subsidy for one purpose, and that is to accomplish what was in the platform and has been in the platform of both political parties for quite a number of years. That is to give Americans better housing and better living conditions.

In understanding the rent-supplement proposal, the purpose of housing legislation should be remembered. The entire purpose of the legislation is to provide better housing for Americans. This is a national objective. It has been in both party platforms for many years. That is the purpose of the rent subsidy. Do not forget the purpose.

Also do not forget there are detailed restrictions which must be understood, too, on this rent subsidy.

First, as to who may be a beneficiary of rent supplements; second, restrictions on income of beneficiaries; third, restrictions on who may be the landlord of the housing unit.

The first of these restrictions limits beneficiaries of the rent supplement further by saying only four categories may be involved—the elderly, the handicapped, those displaced by governmental action; and to people who are currently living in substandard housing. Under the amendment I sponsored, only people whose income is so low that they are eligible for public housing can qualify for any rent supplement.

In prior housing laws there is precedent for the Federal Government assisting all of these categories of persons. The general justification is the ambition of all of us to assist by providing Americans with a good place in which to

live and to rear their children. As far as aiding people displaced in urban renewal projects is concerned, the Housing Act of 1964 recognizes the justice of giving a rent supplement because these people were dislocated by action of the Federal Government. Our humanitarian interests impel us to recognize the elderly and disabled persons and it justifies assistance here. The next justification is in the rent supplement section with the income limitations. Before any persons in the category of eligibility can participate they must not have an income over public housing standards.

After the House cut the appropriation for the rent subsidy in order to assure that regulations would meet my amendment, the Housing and Home Finance Agency issued as the highest maximum income in America which a person could have and still qualify would be $6,500. This would be a high rent area for a family of 7 to 10, requiring 5 bedrooms for decent living.

The final restriction is one that should appeal to all of us, because the method for financing the housing that would be eligible for the rent supplement assistance is by private enterprise. There is a requirement, however, that the legal entity owning such housing eligible for rent supplements shall be a nonprofit corporation, a cooperative association, or a limited dividend corporation. No money is paid directly to the tenant but to the landlord.

All of the legal entities and their objectives shall be approved by the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency to assure conformity with these requirements.

The projects will not only be constructed with private capital, but will remain on the tax digest to be subject to city, county, and State ad valorem taxes just as any other private enterprise. I repeat what I have said before. The projects will be privately owned, privately run, privately built, and privately financed.

The assistance to people who fall in this low income group could be done by an expansion of public housing. This would be at public expense, because public funds build, own, and operate public housing. Local ad valorem taxes are not paid.

The choice of rent subsidy is choice of private enterprise. Providing this assistance by rent subsidy to the people in need of good housing is to move away from public housing. It should be acceptable by people who would like to see no further expansion at public expense.

In the October 1965, issue of the Mortgage Banker, the trade magazine of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, Maurice G. Read, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, is quoted at page 32 as saying that the proposal is a step toward private enterprise in housing:

> While the rent supplement is not what we sought, it does—for the first time—provide a procedure under a Federal program for putting families of inadequate income into adequate housing, without disturbing the function of private ownership of property or private financing of the private owner's mortgage debt.
>
> Along with the new departure authorized for local housing authorities, it may well usher in a much wider scope of service for private mortgage financing.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, if I voted against the rent subsidy proposed, I feel as if I would be voting against private enterprise.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to undertake to agree on a time limitation. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes and that the committee have the last 3 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MOTION OF MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Motion offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: "I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the motion.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is what we were looking for. This is the time of day that we get into a big hurry, you know, so that we can adjourn on Wednesday or Thursday and take the rest of the week off. That has happened many times. I have been sitting here trying to get some time to speak. I dislike using the preferential motion route to get recognized, but when the leadership is trying to limit debate, it seems to be necessary to resort to this procedure.

In the first place, I want to talk to you about some sense. This is a supplemental appropriation bill. It is the second supplemental appropriation bill, if you please.

A few years ago we had to have supplemental appropriation bills because we did not appropriate enough money in the regular appropriation bill. So we made up where we had made some mistakes, or where there had been more expenditures than we thought were necessary at the time the regular bill was passed.

Then, though I do not know when it started, we began to have second supplemental appropriation bills to appropriate more money.

I do not know how in the world anything like a rent subsidy ever got into a supplemental appropriation bill except they say that this is a rent supplement bill. So it should go into a supplemental appropriation bill. That is the only excuse you can have for it, for here we are being called upon for money to start a new program. This is not a supplemental appropriation. It is an initial, original appropriation which opens the door, and the deluge will follow. Again, I repeat, this is not a supplemental appropriation for a rent supplement program, so it has no business in the bill, to start with. That is the first point.

Someone may say, "Well, you are against rent supplements." That is correct. I am against rent supplements, but the reason I am against rent supplements is I believe that is going contrary to what I was taught in my youth. We have preached all of our lives that we believe in the democracy in the United States.

What are we asked to do in respect to this rent subsidy today? We are asked to pattern our life after that of the people of the Soviet Union. I visited over there a few years ago, and I saw some of their housing projects. What do they do there? If a fellow has a large family, he may get a big apartment, and if he has a small income he will pay only a little bit of rent. If the fellow has a larger income, but a smaller family, or possibly just a man and wife, they give him a small apartment and charge him a high rent.

That is what we are talking about taking on here.

Gentlemen and ladies of the House, when will we get back to our principles? I am not so worried about the $12 million as I am worried about the principle involved here today.

I do say, I am a Democrat. This is not a partisan matter at all. I have prided myself on being a responsible Democrat, and I want to pay the bills when they come due.

There has been some talk about inflation here today. I do not believe there is a person in this room who will deny that we are facing inflation. I do not believe there is a person in this room who has kept up with the news, who has read the newspapers, who has listened to the President, and who has attended meetings of any committee around here who does not believe, as I stated last June, that we are going to have another tax increase. I said that when the House passed the bill the other day, "We are going to have another tax increase before this session is completed." I stand by that statement. But, I do not think it would be necessary if we faced up to our responsibilities, and quit adding on, and starting new programs.

Some of the Members had better go back home and talk to the people, to find out what is going on.

I do not mind spending money for anything which is going to benefit the country and benefit the people, but I was in my hometown last week, and I ran into some statements there, which convinced me, and reaffirmed my belief that Congress has not been acting in a responsible manner.

We have all this educational program, under the poverty program, and we are providing teacher aids. Imagine what is put into a room, with a teacher who confusion it causes when a teacher's aid does not want her. When one asks what the teacher aid does, the statement is made, "she erases the blackboard," among other duties designed to relieve the teacher. When I was a youngster I always wanted to erase the blackboard myself, because that gave me an opportunity to go outside and dust off the eraser, to get some time off. Now they have teacher aids, and pay them to do that.

I ran into this when I was home last week. Some of the poverty program people have gone to some school districts

there and have told their money was being allocated to them if they could find ways to spend it. They do not have a program, but the money is being given to them, and the statement is made, "You can take this money under one condition; that is, if you will spend it before June 30." They do not have a program for it.

I am stating now that it is time to wake up to the responsibilities of our office and to quit appropriating money when a need has not been shown for it. There has not been a need shown for this thing. It has no business in a supplemental appropriation bill.

If the House wishes to fund a supplemental rent program, I say the House should do it in a regular appropriation bill, rather than to put it into a supplemental appropriation bill. It can come back in June or July in a regular bill. It will require more money but at least let us act in an orderly and responsible manner.

I say to some of you folks that you do not know what is going on around here, and you are going to face trouble this fall in the coming election. You are going to find out that the poor are not getting any benefit out of many of the programs you have been appropriating millions for, and they will show their resentment at the polls.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, we said at the outset of the debate on this bill that it was wholesome for legislation to be thoroughly discussed in the House.

It seems to me that we have thoroughly discussed the issue about the rent supplement program. I shall undertake to obtain consent to end debate on this section of the bill and all amendments thereto.

I asked unanimous consent that the debate conclude in 13 minutes. I shall again undertake to get a limitation. If not successful, I expect to move that the debate close after a certain number of minutes of time.

It should be pointed out that subsidized housing is not new in this country. Twenty-nine years ago the Congress passed the public housing bill. Neither Congress nor the executive branch has let that program get out of hand. Of course, there have been mistakes. During the 29 years of the public housing program the Federal Government has spent about $1.8 million.

After 29 years of experience with public housing, it has been suggested that we should undertake to provide housing under a free enterprise program, financed by free enterprise.

There are subsidies or the equivalent of subsidies in many Government programs. There are subsidies in the transportation of air mail, the merchant marine, farm programs, and programs of many types.

It is hoped that the rent supplement program will eventually result in the elimination of the public housing program. We have not let public housing get out of hand, and we will not let this rent supplement program get out of hand. I am sure the Congress will continue to control carefully the legislation and the appropriations.

The Committee on Appropriations, after much consideration last year and again this year has worked out a compromise package. It was the best we could do under the circumstances.

In the conference report last year it was indicated that Congress would give further consideration early this year to the rent supplement matter, if a program appropriately circumscribed with regulations and restrictions was submitted.

As I pointed out earlier in the debate, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has said himself that while he is not wholly in accord with this program:

I think this program is superior to public housing, and agree with much of what you said except I am not satisfied that this program will replace public housing.

We are just trying to work out a better way in which to cope with the problem of slums and all of the economic losses incident thereto, and with the crime which is generated in part as a result of the slums. Crime is costing the American taxpayer $27 billion a year according to J. Edgar Hoover. This is not only an effort to help the underprivileged, but an effort to help our whole country.

I urge support for the committee position.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, if it is appropriate at this time, that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think the preferential motion has been disposed of as yet. Second, I am a member of the committee and I have not had an opportunity to discuss the matter at all. I would like to have 5 minutes for our side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The question occurs on the preferential motion.

The preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 15 minutes has been agreed to. The Chair heard no objection. The gentleman from Michigan has already had 5 minutes allotted to him and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be appropriate to call to the attention of the House an item that just appeared on the UPI ticker entitled "Taxes." I quote:

Johnson described controls as distasteful and virtually ruled them out. The President said he has asked Budget Director Charles Schultze to try and make further cuts in the budget during talks with Cabinet officers but Congress was resisting his economy measures in the school milk and aid to education areas and probably would add to overall Government spending.

This is a very appropriate time to begin to assist the President in cutting out this very unnecessary and questionable program when our country is in the kind of position it is now in.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Has the gentleman from Michigan seen the whole big headline of the Washington Evening Star tonight which reads "Prices Climbing; Tax Rise Hinted." It further goes on to say that President Johnson may ask for an income levy boost in April. If anybody votes for this program, they are voting for wartime higher prices and wartime higher taxes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I may say further, Mr. Chairman, that this is the time here today where we can stand up and be counted on this very issue.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. The majority leader referred to "inflation as a cliche." It seems to me that the American people are going to be referring to "inflation as a tragedy."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, there is another edition of the Evening Star, the headlines of which should be noted: "Prices Still Rising, and Sharply. Johnson Supports Drive To Curb Inflation Trend."

The first paragraph says:

President Johnson has launched an intensive personal campaign to persuade business leaders to curtail further capital investments in an effort to stem an inflationary trend of the economy.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman from California.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me just refer once more to this item: Here is the budget presented by the President for fiscal year 1967. On page 350, under Military Construction, which is handled by the subcommittee on which I serve of the Committee on Appropriations, page 350 of this appendix to the budget for fiscal year 1967, under "Family Housing" here is what the President said:

Provision is made in the following schedules to proceed after 1966 with the construction of the 8,500 family housing units authorized and funded in 1966, but deferred in December 1965 following a review of Defense Department expenditures focused on meeting higher priority requirements in direct support of combat forces in Vietnam and elsewhere. On this basis, no additional

funds are required in 1967 for new family housing construction.

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings last year, on page 303 of the Department of Defense appropriation hearings, here is what Secretary of Defense McNamara said:

> I strongly urge the Congress to support our fiscal year 1966 request for 12,500 units. The President has stated that he wants our uniformed citizens to be first-class in every respect, and wants their families to know only first-class lives. We feel that provision of adequate family housing is one of the foundation stones in providing first-class treatment to our Armed Forces, and these have been deferred because of questionable expenditures on the Vietnam war.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say to the members of the Committee that if this is the case, and military family housing is deferred then certainly the rent supplement program can be postponed.

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair observed on their feet at the time of the unanimous-consent request fixing the time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] for 1 minute.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon our able majority leader appropriately stated the case, pointing out how time after time the blind opposition offers excuses for voting against progressive social legislation. A year ago the rent supplement program was offered as a meaningful new approach to the housing problems of our low-income families living in the urban ghettos, but unfortunately the funds were not appropriated. Now the Committee on Appropriations has cut the supplemental appropriation request by 60 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Bow amendment, and at the same time I believe we should fully fund this program, up to the $30 million which has been requested by the administration. Therefore, I support the amendment to increase the appropriation to $30 million; $12 million means only 20,000 units of housing under the rent supplement program. This means for the city of New York approximately 2,000 units. This is totally inadequate. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has 70,000 applications pending.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year in asking the Congress for $30 million for the rent supplement program President Johnson characterized rent subsidies as the "most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American city."

I can only observe that, after emerging from the Appropriations Committee, this program is a most misshapen instrument indeed.

By slashing the President's request from $30 million to $12 million, and by inserting a provision that would give local public officials authority to veto any project in their community, the entire rent supplement experiment has been seriously impaired.

The concept of the subsidy plan was to build new housing through private, nonprofit or limited dividend concerns for occupancy by low income families. Federal payments would be made to landlords to make up the difference between the rent charged and 25 percent of the occupants' income.

Through the device of rent supplements we could expand significantly the number of units available for low-income families. Furthermore, it was hoped that, by employing rent subsidies, we could assist in moving low-income families out of the slums and ghettos and into the mainstream of American life.

The President saw the rent supplement program as being "vital to our efforts to improve the quality of life in America."

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has received expressions of interest in the subsidy program from potential sponsors of nearly 70,000 new units. The $30 million request would have covered reservation of contract authority for 50,000 rent supplement housing units. The estimate is based on the assumption that the average annual rent supplement per unit will be $600 or a monthly rate of $50 per unit.

Cutting the $30 million request by 60 percent to $12 million will reduce the number of new units that can be constructed to about 20,000.

At a time when our housing needs on a nationwide basis are mounting at an alarming rate, it is unconscionable to cut back on what could be one of the most farseeing and progressive housing programs drafted in the last 30 years.

I have contended from the very beginning of the debate over this program that the $30 million figure was much too modest in the face of the Nation's housing needs.

At a time when we should be constructing on the order of 200,000 new low-rent units a year, at the most 35,000 new units annually are authorized under the public housing program.

Officials in the Department of Housing and Urban Development testified recently before the House Housing Subcommittee that there are some 500,000 families on waiting lists for public housing throughout the country. In New York City alone more than 125,000 are on the waiting list.

Despite the billions of dollars spent on housing programs in the last three decades, the Nation's housing situation continues to deteriorate at an ever quickening pace.

In New York City recently the results of a community renewal program survey of the city's housing inventory disclosed that 500,000 families, or 22 percent of the city's households, were ill housed. Some 400,000 of these families are in the low-income category, having incomes of less than $6,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, for the last 20 years each housing bill is thought of as a fresh start in what will develop into a massive national attack to bridge the gap between the demand and the supply of economical housing for low-income families.

Yet the massive attack that is required to provide every American with decent, safe, and sanitary housing never materializes.

To conceal this, each year the housing program is put in a new package. What the program lacks in substance it makes up for with illusions. Disguised as something brand new, as something bold, the package is merchandised as the breakthrough that will lead to a dramatic solution to our acute housing problems.

But after removing the tinsel ribbon and tearing away the layers of tissue paper, we find disappointment.

Last year hopes were raised higher than ever because of the claims that were made on behalf of the rent supplement program. So masterful—even artful—was the packaging of the rent subsidy program that even the most skeptical found the plan arresting.

The point of the rent subsidy plan was a simple one—to increase the supply of housing available to the very poor. The plan was to be accomplished in partnership with private developers.

The rent subsidy program would be applicable either for constructing new units or for bringing about the rehabilitation of old but deteriorating dwellings.

Potentially it could be employed on a large scale to ease the problems of the slum ghettos by promoting the movement of low-income families out of the urban slums into suburban and other surroundings that more nearly reflect mainstream American life.

How can these objectives be achieved with the rent supplement program that is before us now?

The $12 million is totally inadequate for the magnitude of the task ahead. Even the $30 million request of the President's was a disappointment.

But beyond that, the provision permitting local communities to have a veto power over the program is even more disturbing. Clearly, this limitation has been written into the bill to block the possible exodus of low-income families into communities outside the central core of our cities. Local officials in these lilywhite bedroom suburbs can be expected to exercise this veto power to prevent the have-nots from coming into the community and mixing with the haves.

At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to strike out this local veto.

Moreover, as a Representative of the largest city in the Nation—a city plagued by staggering housing problems—I am discouraged that the cost ceilings on rent supplement housing are so limited that New York City may not be able to participate in the program on any large scale. The regulations issued by the Department set unrealistic ceilings for the big cities.

The cost ceilings, below the public housing limit, will not permit the con-

struction of three-bedroom apartments costing more than $15,000. According to the Committee on Housing and Urban Renewal of the Archdiocese of New York, the cost of housing which it is sponsoring in the Tompkins Square Urban Renewal Area is in excess of $21,500 per dwelling unit.

Mr. Chairman, I might also point out that the asset and income limitations are below the limits usually imposed in public housing. Why this should be so is a mystery.

Because of the deficiencies and inconsistencies which I have outlined I must be restrained in my enthusiasm. I hope that the conferees from the other body will insist upon a larger appropriation and upon eliminating the restrictions which have been written into this bill. The local veto is a most serious obstacle to the implementation of the original concept embodied in the rent subsidy program, and I urge support for the amendment which I intend to offer to eliminate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] for 1 minute.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I refer to a headline in the night final edition of today's Washington Evening Star in which President Johnson appeals to business leaders and will hold a dinner tomorrow night in a further appeal to these business leaders to curtail capital investment as an antiinflationary move.

One of the subheadlines in this same article says that the climb in the cost of living is the biggest in February since 1951.

I would remind the House that it was after that rise in February 1951, that we were forced to accept price and wage controls in this country.

I raised the question here today—are we going to defy the advice that President Johnson gives to businessmen to curtail capital investments and expenditures? Are we going to ignore his advice and then bring ourselves to a situation where we will have wage and price controls and a tax increase to boot?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. Bow the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. CEDERBERG.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be appropriate to try to point out that in discussing family housing for the military not only is military family housing involved but enlisted men's barracks in many of our military locations around the country.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS] was speaking a while ago from the well of the House and I thought I should call to his attention what was happening in the State of Georgia.

An enlisted men's barracks complex for $8,895,000 was deferred at Fort Gordon.

An enlisted WAC's barracks for $604,000 was deferred at Fort Gordon.

These are necessities for our military men and women who need housing. If you do not believe this, go to some of these installations. You will see they are installing tents and living in tents while some of this construction has had to be deferred.

How can we make any commonsense out of voting for this rent supplement program at this time? I say even if it is justified, under the present circumstances this is a matter that ought to be deferred and what we ought to do is to help President Johnson cut the budget as he is requesting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] for 1 minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I only rise to reiterate the arguments that have been made here before.

If we vote for the rent supplement program, a program that has a 40-year commitment—that will last until the year 2006—if we commit ourselves and future Congresses to the expenditure of $480 million for this period of time, we are in effect stimulating the problems that we see on the headlines of this paper and the problems that will be on the headline of every paper of the United States for the next 24 hours—that prices are climbing and that taxes are going to go up because of the lack of fiscal responsibility in the Congress and in the White House.

I hope and trust that we in the Congress will defeat this rent subsidy proposal so that the Congress can make its contribution along the line of fiscal responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] for 1 minute.

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bow amendment and against the Farbstein amendment.

As I said in general debate, this is a new scheme for economic integration and not, as suggested by friends on the other side of the aisle, for adequate housing of the poor.

This rent supplement experimental scheme is contrary to our American way of living. It will definitely undermine and destroy American incentive to improve oneself by his own efforts.

Let us make no mistake about this scheme: It will not provide the maximum number of low-cost housing units we need to house our poor.

But it will provide middle-income housing for some of the poor with our hard-earned taxes in the form of subsidies.

This rent supplement scheme is a more expensive way of housing people than our program of public housing.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in general debate, said something to the effect that the "situation has been vastly improved." I would assume from his talk that he referred to the Department's regulations.

Well, let me say that the regulations have been changed and improved but not sufficiently to prevent abuses.

The Secretary still has the power to hand out unlimited amounts of subsidies because there still is no dollar limit as to the amount of rent subsidy any family can receive.

There is still no limit as to the percentage of any family's rent that the Secretary can pay out in subsidies. It could be 25 to 50 percent or even more.

There is still no safeguard on the definition of "income."

The Secretary will still decide what is "income" and what may be excluded in calculating income.

The rent subsidy scheme is still unfair—more particularly unfair to middle-income taxpayers who must shoulder the extra taxes to provide similar apartments for others who cannot afford the full rental in the same building.

The chairman, in his remarks, talked about this being only a $12 million appropriation. That it was cut from $30 million requested by the administration. It might be a small amount in comparison to the budget. But, let us not forget that once we get the rent subsidy foot in the door, this will be the beginning of a $6 billion program running for 40 years.

The chairman expressed great concern about our blighted cities—our slums.

Let me tell you that this program will not clean out our slums because under the limitation of $15,000 per unit costs, no cities with slums will benefit because the cost of labor and land will make it impossible to build in our cities. I don't say this—the archdiocese of New york says it—and it will force rent supplement to the suburbs.

I might also point out that I do not agree with the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, when he says that this is the "private enterprise approach." It might be a private enterprise approach but with almost twice of the taxpayers' money to subsidize the rents.

This rent subsidy scheme is wrong and wasteful and should be scraped.

In this period of war, we cannot afford to sacrifice guns for frills and gravy—we cannot afford to experiment—and that is what we will be doing under this scheme.

With inflation at our heel, with rising costs and higher taxes facing our taxpayers, now is certainly not the time to waste our taxpayers' money on experiments of rent subsidies. I hope the majority of the Members of this House will have the courage to vote for the Bow amendment and defeat this rent subsidy scheme.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for 1 minute.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the comment made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, let me say I am perfectly willing to be counted on this issue and I am sure that every Congressman from the big cities is willing to be counted on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, housing is not stopping. Construction is not stopping. There are approximately 1 million units that are going to be built this year. But they are going to be built for people who can afford to pay for that housing.

The people who will not be able to enjoy the new construction and the new housing will be those whom the rent subsidy program seeks to help; namely, the poor, the disabled, and the elderly.

That is why this Bow amendment must be voted down.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make is that the decay of our cities is not stopping because of the war in Vietnam. That decay must be stopped. The cities need every kind of tool that they can get to try to stop decay. They need urban renewal. They need programs of this type in order to provide housing that is necessary.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] for 1 minute.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, when the administration's rent supplement plan was first presented, I voted against it twice—on both authorizing and funding it. Although approving the intent of the program, I felt its original eligibility provisions were unrealistic and unworkable.

As a result of revisions which have since been made, I now support the program. Lower income limitations and other eligibility restrictions have won broad public support. The National Association of Real Estate Boards, which also opposed the original measure, now supports the program—as do the national league of cities, the U.S. conference of mayors, organized labor, senior citizens and most church groups.

This program probably represents the best formula ever devised to help poor people obtain adequate shelter and remove civic blight without the bad features of public housing.

I have determined that under this measure, San Diego will be able to launch programs to improve conditions for many families and aged couples now in substandard housing. Among these is a Methodist Church project now pending under the 221–D3 program. If anything else were needed to obtain my support for rent supplements, this factor provided it.

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. BROCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, what kind of shortsightedness does it take for this body to see the President request that business stop investment in capital expenditures because of inflation on the same day that we begin a subsidy program like this? Those productive facilities will provide the very means by which the poor can take themselves out of the slums and out of the poverty. Can we claim the same for this bill? It is incredible to me that we are not willing to listen to the advice of the people.

You have all seen the result of polls taken in every different part of the country. In California the voting was 2 to 1 against it, in Chicago 5 to 1 against it, in Pennsylvania 10 to 1 against it. I think it is inexcusable that we take this action today, accepting the dual standard of an administration which insists on reducing investment by business in production facilities, an investment which creates long-range employment, while advocating a 40-year subsidy.

(Mr. CALLAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, we have heard many arguments against this rent subsidy program. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] made a point that struck home to me because I, too, had a chance this fall to visit the Soviet Union. The people of the Soviet Union today are proud of their public housing. They openly brag about their fine new apartments. These apartments are extremely poor by our standards, however. They are designed by the Central Government and they are all alike, whether the apartments are in the cold climate of Leningrad or the warm tropics of Tashkent. They are drab, colorless, four stories high without elevators, overcrowded, and of extremely poor construction. While we in this country might never go this far in centralizing our housing, we can certainly expect under a rent subsidy program all kinds of Federal guidelines and standards.

What we want in the United States is more individual initiative, not more Federal control of our housing in a program that will take away for many Americans the desire to own their own individual homes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to put the question before us today in focus. There is a request for $12 million for a 3-month appropriation to furnish units under the rent supplement program. There is in existence a rent certificate program for which 3,000 units have been prescribed already. Three thousand more units are requested. That is in existence. It will furnish immediate housing. The rent supplement program would take at least 1 year for units under rehabilitation and modernization and over 2 years on new construction. If anyone thinks there will be any immediate relief under the rent supplement program, they are just plain not thinking it through.

There is a program on the books, the rent certificate program which, if used and utilized with funds available to the administration, we could get immediate relief throughout the United States. Governor Brown of California says that California can use 15,000 units under that program immediately. This program is in being and the funds are available.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for 1 minute.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have had wholesome debate on this matter. I think we all recognize that it is preferable to move in this direction of private enterprise in housing construction. I repeat that this is a free enterprise bill in concept. The project calls for privately financed, privately owned, privately built, and privately managed and operated. The Home Builders Association of this country supports the bill. They say it is a worthwhile program.

If private enterprise think they can build the needed housing why not give them an opportunity to do it? The outlay of public funds would be considerably less under a rent supplement program than under the public housing program. This program would be financed 30 percent under public housing costs to the Government.

The Democratic platform in the last several years and the Republican Party platforms have stated that we should move faster in the field of providing a program of better housing for the poor and those living in substandard housing. This is a national objective of both parties. We should get on with the job that needs to be done.

The regulations and standards we have discussed should be written into law. The amendment should be defeated and this bill passed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAHON. What is the issue before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is about to state the question. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 4, strike out lines 15 through 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 153, noes 183.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CEDERBERG

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CEDERBERG: On page 4, line 22, after "program" and before the period add, *"Provided further,* That no part of these funds shall be obligated until funds made available for the construction of family housing for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Defense agencies in Public Law 89–202, have been obligated."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late. The Chair was about to state the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question had not yet been put. The Chair was about to state the question, but the question had not yet been put. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it relates to funds previously appropriated and which are not carried in this bill and interferes with executive discretion given to the President under existing law to do what he wishes with the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan briefly on the point of order.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to try to be sure that our military families are given an equal opportunity to have family housing that has been deferred. This matter has adequately been discussed in the debate previous to this time. I had hoped possibly out of the generousness of the hearts of the gentlemen on the Democratic side that they would not raise a point of order and therefore obviously deny our military service families the right to have these houses that they so desperately need.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan places an unrelated contingency upon the use of funds provided in this paragraph, and as such is legislation in an appropriation bill, and not germane to the paragraph.

The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

For the National Teacher Corps authorized in part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $10,000,000: *Provided,* That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: *Provided further,* That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against lines 21 and 22——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against lines 21 and 22 on page 9, and lines 1 through 8 on page 10 of H.R. 14012, on the basis that the language contained in lines 4 through 8, beginning with "*Provided further,*" impose additional duties upon the State educational agencies in any of the States participating in the program, these additional duties being not contained in the basic legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I cite Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, section 6884, and I quote:

A point of order being made against an entire paragraph, and being sustained because a portion only is out of order, the entire paragraph goes out; but it is otherwise if the point is made only against the portion out of order.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I contend that lines 4 through 8 on page 10 of the bill should be held not in order and that the whole paragraph therefore, beginning with lines 21 and 22 on page 9, and extending through lines 1 through 8 on page 10, be held not in order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the language does not provide any additional duties of any kind. There is not a word in the four lines that have been cited by the gentleman from Ohio that would require additional duties of any kind.

Previously this afternoon when the point of order was raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin on the rent supplement program, the language on page 4 of the bill is just about the same in that paragraph as is in the paragraph cited by the gentleman from Ohio. That was ruled germane by the Chairman earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I submit there is not one single, solitary word in this language that would impose any further duties upon anyone. We do not tell anyone to do anything. It is the exact same language as was ruled germane on page 4 earlier today.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state in view of the ruling earlier today on the rent supplement paragraph, it would seem to me this language should be ruled in order.

No State superintendent of public instruction or State director of education is required to perform any additional duties because of this language.

The amendment was offered in the committee and in view of the previous ruling, it would seem the language does not require an affirmative act. The State superintendent could do absolutely nothing and the Teachers Corps would not apply in that State.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the point here is very clear so far as I can see. The Chair has already ruled today on a similar point of order and this is exactly the same language.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] wish to be heard further?

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we do have a different situation here than we did on the matter on which the ruling was made earlier.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this provides that none of these funds may be spent on behalf of the National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to the approval by the State educational agency. This is an affirmative action which must be taken by a State before the funds can be used. It is not a limitation but is a requirement for an affirmative action to be taken by the States before this becomes effective.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no affirmative action to be taken by anybody. This is completely negative. The argument of the gentleman from Ohio, with all due deference, does not apply here and the situation here is exactly the same as with reference to the language on page 4.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that the language to which the point of order is directed constitutes a valid limitation on an appropriation and is negative in nature and does not impose any affirmative duties or additional duties on the administration.

The Chair rules for the reasons set forth by the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Wisconsin, and as stated by the Chairman in the ruling on the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin earlier, that the point of order is not sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF OREGON

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon: Strike out all of lines 21 and 22 on page 9 and lines 1 through 8 on page 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon in support of his amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I further ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment with a little trepidation after hearing the distinguished minority whip characterize the individual who is going to offer such an amendment of being pretty much in the role of a villain.

You know I am not much used to wearing a black hat and riding a black horse and I hope I will be forgiven if I discard the costume that has been assigned to me and put on my white hat and mount my white charger to give you the reasons why I am opposed to this section of the bill and why I think it ought to be deleted.

I suppose one of the main reasons is inflation. Of course, this has been discussed and cussed, perhaps sufficiently, here this afternoon. I want to express myself and let the people of my district and this country know that I feel that

next to the hazards and difficulties of Vietnam, this specter of inflation is a problem that worries me as much as any other problem facing us today.

This Government is not ignoring the problem. As you know, the rediscount rate has been raised. The prime interest rate has been raised.

Social security taxes will take $6 billion out of the economy this year. We have raised excise taxes. These actions will tend to stabilize the economy, and I think we should be careful not to move too rapidly or too vigorously and start a disastrous decline. We can also help by exercising discretion and care at the appropriation level. This does not mean that we should vote "no" on every appropriation, but it does mean that we should carefully evaluate the relative priorities.

In my judgment, the Teacher Corps is a prime candidate for deletion. The minority whip suggested that we should not be stopping programs that we have already started. I suggest to him that this is not a continuing program. This is a new program that has never been funded. He says that we should not turn our backs on progressive programs. I suggest that that is not even an issue, because I think there is no Congress, except the 88th, that has a better record than the 89th Congress when it comes to progressive legislation, and most of that, but not all, I have supported.

Even today on the rent supplemental bill I supported the administration and supported the committee, primarily because of its relevance to the problems of the many "Watts" areas around the country smoldering in bitter resentment as the benefits of our economy pass them by.

Enough on the inflationary end of it. Turning to the merits of the proposal itself, we had Mr. Howe, the Commissioner of Education, before our committee. He agreed, except for the timing, that there was nothing they could do under the Teachers Corps bill that they could not do under title I of the primary and secondary education bill, except possibly give the Federal Government the power to assemble and train these teachers. This, in my judgment, is not necessarily a desirable feature, a desirable responsibility, to place in the hands of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, this is the feature that poses the most difficulty in the minds of those who oppose this program on its merits.

The budget for 1967 contains a figure in excess of $1 billion for title I of the primary and secondary education bill. Title I money serves areas with concentrations of children from low-income families as does the Teacher Corps program. Title I money is available to improve the educational programs to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children. It is available for a program for handicapped children, for the expense of school curriculum, for decreasing class sizes and so the teacher's time may be free of extracurricular activities. All of these functions are the functions of the Teacher Corps. They are interchangeable and the Commissioner of Education confessed, and I use that word advisedly, that "we could perhaps get title I funds operating this way, but I think it would be a shift in emphasis."

It was suggested by another of the witnesses that a difference was that title I relied on school districts to propose projects. But certainly we have been assured many times that the Teacher Corps contemplates local initiative and that none will be commenced except on the request of the local community.

The only thing that can be done under a Teacher Corps that cannot be done under title I is the Federal assemblage and training of teachers, the Federal payment of the salaries and, according to this bill, matching contributions of 10 percent. And this is the very point of controversy on the merits that will be eliminated if this Teacher Corps program is eliminated.

It has been suggested that problems will arise because these Teacher Corps people will be paid full-time salaries for part-time work. This problem would not exist if we reject this program.

Frequently, we discern duplication in programs that we have approved where none was anticipated. We strive to eliminate it and are critical of the Executive for tolerating it. Unless we approve the Duncan amendment, we are knowingly creating and funding unnecessary duplication and doing it at a time when our economy and the stability of our dollar cannot stand it.

The majority whip says that this will create no inflation—that we must have "faith" in our system.

Well, I have faith in our system. I think the actions of this Congress and its fiscal policies have created and sustained the prosperity we enjoy. But there are two sides to this fiscal policy. Faith alone is not enough. It requires our courageous and affirmative action to make certain that we apply the restraints as readily as we apply the stimuli when the situation so demands.

I want the economy sustained. I do not want the fruits of what we have done destroyed by a devalued dollar. Should this occur it will hurt most the very people we are trying to help.

The President was quoted in the morning papers as asking for voluntary restraint on private and governmental spending. Our President has asked us to "help" him restrain Government spending. Here, in my judgment, is a chance to "help" him and I am going to try. I hope you will join me and delete this very marginal Teacher Corps program which, at the very least, can await the termination of the crisis in southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. When time was limited, the following Members were observed standing: Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. BOW, Mr. MAHON, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. GROSS, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. GOODELL.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement each Member will be recognized for 1¼ minutes, with the exception of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the most striking aspect of this proposal—which has never been considered by a substantive committee of the House—is its utter lack of relationship to other Federal programs. Under careful questioning the Commissioner of Education admitted that the prime objective of the National Teacher Corps would be to train prospective teachers—the "interns"—to work with disadvantaged students. In fact, he made clear that the training component was the only feature that distinguished National Teacher Corps from projects already funded under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Yet the Higher Education Act, enacted in 1965, authorizes the award of 10,000 fellowships for graduate study to persons interested in a career in elementary and secondary education; in another section—title IV–B—it authorizes 100-percent loan forgiveness for student borrowers who subsequently teach in schools having large numbers of disadvantaged children. Moreover, title XI of the National Defense and Education Act authorizes summer and full session training institutes for teachers who are going to work with disadvantaged pupils.

The point is that each of these programs, although having a slightly different focus, either is directed or could be directed toward the identical purpose of getting more persons into the schools to work with disadvantaged children. And each program competes for the same pool of college graduates and teachers. The schools, meanwhile, often using Federal money, are competing with each other and with the Federal programs for the services of the same group of individuals.

This exhibits wild confusion of purpose in Federal programs which overlap, duplicate, and compete. The introduction of a Federal Teacher Corps on this scene adds but another complication in a situation that is passing rapidly out of the control of local school administrators who have the primary responsibility for staffing our schools.

There is a shortage of experienced teachers which is even more acute among those whose experience is in slum schools. Yet it is precisely these individuals who would be drained off by the National Teacher Corps to be placed at the disposal of the Federal education agency. The journeyman teachers who would work under them would also be drawn from hard-pressed school systems. The subsequent reassignment of these individuals to other systems would not represent a net gain to education.

This leaves only the "interns" to establish any additional value in the program, and that is a questionable proposition.

Even the Commissioner of Education admitted that educationally deprived pupils in low-income neighborhoods would be used as guinea pigs by National Teacher Corps. Yet these are the children who need the most expert instruction and guidance, rather than experimental help from "interns" who themselves are trying to discover whether they wish to be teachers. The proposal is not responsive to the real needs of slum schools or to the problems of school administrators.

If the Federal purpose is to assist school administrators in getting more teachers, and particularly more experienced teachers, into schools serving disadvantaged pupils, then greater emphasis should be placed on the National Defense Education Act institutes for teachers of the disadvantaged and upon the fellowship program for teachers. These, in conjunction with title I projects, should provide a flow of qualified teachers into schools where they are most needed. They do not complicate educational administration by draining experienced personnel out of one program to be used in another.

CONFLICTING FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The Commissioner of Education as asserted—as have each of his predecessors—that there is a shortage of experienced personnel in the schools. It is curious, therefore, that Federal programs should compete with the schools, and among themselves, for personnel in short supply. Yet this unquestionably is true. The Job Corps, for example is draining counseling and guidance personnel from the public schools at substantially higher salaries than school systems can pay. The same is true of vocational teachers who must be relied on by both the public schools and the Federal manpower and development and training program.

Meanwhile, between school systems—and within them, for that matter—title I projects and title III supplemental centers require the same kind of experienced teachers, therapists, counselors, and other professional personnel that are also required in the regular school program, with the result that competition increases. Within the same State, a wealthy school district—such as Montgomery County, Md., the wealthiest in the Nation—nevertheless gets funds for title I projects and thus extends its competitive advantage over poor districts in obtaining experienced personnel. Between States the title I formula—based upon her pupil educational expenditures—produces even a greater disparity, and hence greater competitive advantage in the high-expenditure States.

The funding of the National Teachers Corps would introduce yet another element of competition and confusion, to say nothing of the dangers inherent in the concept.

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

We have heard no justification for paying 100 percent, or 90 percent, or any part of the salaries of some public school teachers that would not apply to all teachers similarly situated. The National Teachers Corps teachers and interns would be federally supported personnel available to those schools selected by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. However rationalized, it always comes down to that fact which must be justified.

How are these personnel different from experienced teachers, or beginning teachers, already employed by the schools and already assigned to classes with a high concentration of disadvantaged children? Moreover, how are they different from any other public school teacher, assuming that all children have an equal right to an education without regard to family income?

We are setting a dangerous precedent which—as described in a memorandum prepared in HEW—might ultimately involve Federal responsibilty for the salaries of 2 million local employees.

Moreover, we are moving also in the direction of creating Federal schools for one class of children set aside on the basis of family income. In our judgment there should be the most complete and searching study of the implications of this for our educational system, our Federal structure, and for our society. We know of no such examination of the proposal.

FEDERAL CONTROL INHERENT

No type of legislative or statutory disclaimer can avoid the inherent Federal controls in this proposal.

First. It is the Commissioner of Education who would select among applicants for the National Teacher Corps. Local administrators could only choose among the chosen. The Federal Government, except under unique circumstances such as Indian schools and department of Defense dependents' schools, has never been in the business of recruiting teachers. We feel this to be a State, local, and private responsibility best kept out of Federal hands.

Second. The Federal Government would select the institutions which would provide National Teacher Corps training. This is not a critical point, but it is an additional Federal leverage in the program.

Third. Except for appropriations language, part of which may be subject to a point of order, State education agencies have no say in the program, which puts the Federal Government in a direct relationship with local school districts in a manner foreign to our whole structure of education. Obviously, the authorizing statute needs careful revision at this point which cannot be supplied by the Committee on Appropriations from year to year.

Finally, even if a positive role for the State agency were written into the authorization in the manner we have done, the U.S. Commissioner of Education alone has the power to pick and choose among the local school districts applying for such aid. This is the real power, often obscured, wielded by the U.S. Office of Education.

In any such program, there is extensive "discussion" between the applicant and the Federal agency. Clearly, when the Commissioner and his delegates make this final determination, it is made on their terms and conditions. The fact that this process is largely informal makes it no less lethal as a Federal weapon to shape local school practices. It is precisely the point at which Federal control is effectively exercised.

CONCLUSION

Much more could be said about the NTC proposal. Significantly, the public reaction of education organizations, teachers, and school administrators has mostly been that of cool silence; it masks a deep private hostility. The rejection of this proposal would in itself strengthen the independence of local school administration.

More than anything else in education today we need a consistent, orderly Federal policy directed at strengthening State and local school systems, reaffirming the independence and integrity of our educational structure, and helping to solve the basic problems which stand in the way of achieving equal opportunity for a high-quality education. Far from contributing to the development of such a policy, the National Teacher Corps would further confuse and fragment a Federal educational effort which is becoming chaotic.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion, because in my judgment we will be doing harm to the war effort if we were to adopt the gentleman's motion. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we enacted last year has been received well throughout this Nation and has challenged the imagination and resources of our educators and of our local educational systems. This new legislation increases the capacity of local educational agencies to acquire the equipment, provide closed circuit television, teaching machines, numerous other improvements, but all these things cannot be effective unless we have a good teacher in that classroom.

Last fall more than 240,000 beginning teachers were needed for the Nation's schools. The mark was missed by more than 100,000. This shortage was most severe and evident in the schools that could not pay for enough qualified teachers.

The Teachers Corps proposal zeroes in on this important aspect of enhancing the effectiveness of our new elementary and secondary school programs in those schools that need them most. It was our hope that we would be able to improve the quality of education of those children in the disadvantaged areas by increasing the number of teachers and equipping them with the necessary training with which to deal with the educationally deprived youngster.

Let me emphasize that this proposal is not one to establish a Federal employee in the local school classroom, but rather it is a means by which teaching personnel may be trained and made available upon the request of local school systems for work in the classroom under the direct supervision of local school administrators. Members of the Teacher Corps, after a minimum training period of 3 months, would go by invitation to our disadvantaged schools districts to supplement the teaching

force. In all instances, the corpsman would be employed by the local school district. The district would have direct control over them deciding where they are to be assigned and transferred and what they are to teach. Federal funds which we are voting on today would be provided to the school district to cover corpsmen's salaries but corpsmen would be on the local district's payroll.

In the local school district members of the corps would be paid salaries comparable to those of local teachers in similar teaching assignments. In my judgment this program will provide the means by which we may attract qualified persons not only into the field of teaching but into the specialized field of teaching the disadvantaged child in the disadvantaged school system. I urge the concurrence of all the Members of the House in the funds reported by this committee, and I would take this occasion to extend my sincere appreciation to the fine work done by the Appropriations Committee in bringing this important legislation to the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODELL yielded his time to Mr. QUIE.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon and I want to talk only on the merits of the National Teacher Corps.

Last year, when the National Teacher Corps was before us, the Congress did not study this legislation. The House spent virtually no time studying it. The House does not know whether this is a wise measure or not if it depends on the hearings for information. We did not hear testimony from anybody from the administration before the Committee on Education and Labor. In fact, we heard testimony from only one person, a Member of the other body.

With that little study, this program was really forced on us in conference when it came over from the other body. This we do know about the National Teacher Corps. It throws the Federal Government further into an influence on education than any other measure we have had before us. This was well developed recently before the Appropriations Committee and can be read in the hearings, and the gentleman from Oregon was just alluding to it. You can see in the hearings where Commissioner Howe said that in any other programs, such as title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act, the State school people will have authority to develop programs. Here they will not, except the decision as to whether they will accept a teacher.

I can point to a memorandum that was sent to the majority Members last year by the administration, wherein they said that "We also believe it will be better from the viewpoint of an internal control of personnel for the school district to make the major payment of teachers' salaries." In this bill the teachers are funded 90 percent by Federal funds. That is not the major payment by the local school district.

The local school district may choose whether the teachers may come or not. But when the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost, all the school districts will want the teachers. If there are more school districts asking for teachers than there are teachers, the Federal Government, as pointed out by the Commissioner of Education, will make the decisions as to the schools to which the teachers will go.

The school can decide whether the teacher remains or not. The school cannot fire teachers from the Corps. This is decided by the commissioner.

The commissioner selects every person who goes into the program. He will set up contracts with the universities or make decisions on the kind of training program they will have.

This will be a huge step toward Federal standardization in our schools and a precedent will be set where the Federal Government pays most of the salaries of school teachers. It is an unwise action. It is important that local school districts not the Federal Government pay the major portion of teachers salaries. I hope you will support the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon.

We don't know what the future has in store for us with the passage of a bill funding the National Teacher Corps. In answer to a question by Mr. FOGARTY on page 10 of the hearings about planning for the future, Commissioner Howe said:

> In this program not a great deal, and yet I make this observation—that planning for the future here is going to depend on the first year's experience with this and, secondly, that planning for the future of this eventually means an increase in the scope of it. But I think this is a reasonable scope for the first year's start. We have some things to learn in the planning process here, in selecting these people, training them, and getting them into the schools. We will be ready for a major move, I hope, after the first year's experience.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON yielded his time to Mr. BRADEMAS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable regret that I must rise in opposition to the amendment of the next U.S. Senator from the great State of Oregon and I do so only out of a desire to see the Teacher Corps retained.

I hope very much that his amendment will be defeated. I remind the Members of the House that last year, in a rollcall vote on the Teacher Corps proposal, the Members of this House made clear their strong support of Teacher Corps by voting to retain it by a margin of 74 votes.

What is the purpose of the Teacher Corps? I think we need to have that in mind if we are to understand the issue before us. The Teacher Corps has two primary objectives: first, to help break the cycle of poverty through more and better training of the children of poverty; and second, to attract, train, and retain interested, dedicated persons to the field of teaching the disadvantaged.

Under title V–B of the Higher Education Act, dedicated and able young men and women—like those who have made the Peace Corps such a success—will be recruited and trained to teach where they are most needed, in city slums and areas of rural poverty across the Nation. Teacher Corps members will be recruited nationally on the basis of talent and promise and will be trained by the Nation's colleges and universities. They will serve up to 2 years—side by side with local teachers—on request from State and local educational authorities. Some will be experienced teachers; others, teacher interns who will work in teams under the direction of experienced teachers. All will get university preservice training as well as a program of in-service graduate education leading to an advanced degree.

As we know from the debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of last year, there are some 5 million school-age children in this country who are members of families the annual income of which is $2,000 or less. We need to bring bright young teachers into the school systems where such children are concentrated in order to help improve the education of these children.

Mr. Chairman, through recruiting able young men and women to teach in pockets of poverty, the Teachers Corps will add to our source of schoolteachers generally throughout the Nation.

My good friend from Minnesota has suggested that he does not like the idea of so much Federal financing. I would remind him that it was he who suggested that we should have 100 percent Federal financing of the Teachers Corps if it were confined to providing teachers of childrein in Headstart-type programs.

So I think it is not a fair point for him to make that substantial Federal financing is inappropriate when applied to teachers at the elementary and secondary school level. I think it is also important to respond to the criticism which was made that the Teacher Corps is a harbinger of some sort of Federal teacher program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to grant 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be given 2 minutes of his time. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the time has not been fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed. Under the order fixing the time, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has the last 5 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I would, in response to the criticism made by my friend from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] that the Teacher Corps is moving in the direction of some sort of Federal teacher program, a point to the language in section 516 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 which makes clear that members of the Teacher Corps are under the direct supervision of the appropriate officials of the local educational agency to which they are assigned. These local school districts retain the authority to assign teachers within their system and to make transfers of teachers within their system and to determine the curriculum they are to teach as well as the terms and continuance of assignment of such members within their system. So it is simply not accurate to suggest there will be a heavy Federal hand from Washington telling these teachers what to do and teach.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the next Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Cannot all of these things which you are suggesting, be done under title I of the Primary and Secondary Educational Act under which $1 billion is being requested next year?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think one answer to the question of the gentleman is, "Not at all adequately or sufficiently." Let me give the gentleman just one example. Right now in the Subcommittee on General Education of which the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], is the chairman, we are considering Mr. PERKINS' bill which would authorize funds for the construction of facilities for elementary and secondary school students because title I is just not adequate to this purpose.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield again, the Commissioner of Education took a contrary view. This amendment gets around all of these problems raised in connection with the Teacher Corps of Federal intervention and controls whether they are realistic objections or not.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I do not find it necessary, I may say to my friend from Oregon, always to agree with the distinguished Commissioner of Education, much as I respect him. I hope Members of this Congress and members of this and other committees of Congress are entitled to have the right to express their own viewpoint on this and other matters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], for 1¼ quarter minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I regret we have so limited a time on such an important subject matter, but the real thrust of this program is not the disadvantaged kid that you all thought was going to get a better education, but the real thrust is to give the person with an undergraduate degree a master's degree and a doctor's degree at Government expense. As for the quality of teachers in the intern program listen to this from the hearing record, page 42. Mr. DUNCAN asked a question in the hearing as follows:

Actually you are going to have minimum training before you put them on the job?

Mr. Howe answered:

They will have this summer which is a "quickie" and then there will be on-the-job intensive supervision with master teachers in the program.

On the next page I asked:

In effect what you are doing is using disadvantage children as gulnea pigs for somebody in practice teaching?

Mr. Howe says:

In part this is true.

That is exactly what you are doing here. Taking people with inadequate preparation to teach and no minimum hours of education and saying to them "you are going to get in the education program and teach disadvantaged kids." You are not giving the so-called disadvantaged kid a better advantage by embarking upon this kind of program. You are dead wrong if you think otherwise. What the gentleman from Oregon said is correct, under titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Act you can do all of these things. I will place in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence to bear this out and will also include the hearing record wherein the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN], and I take the subject matter apart with the Commissioner of Education Mr. Howe and his associates.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1966.

Mr. NORMAN KARSH,
Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KARSH: As you know during the supplemental appropriation hearings on the Teacher Corps and again on title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the question of financing a Teacher Corps type project under title I of E.S.E.A. was discussed.

In order to verify the telephone conversation with respect to this matter that you had with my office today, I would like to have your answers in writing to the following questions:

1. Is it possible for a group of school districts, if it wished, to allocate major portions of its title I funds to set up a teacher training arrangement analogous to the arrangement planned for the Teacher Corps?

2. It is possible for a group of school districts to submit an acceptable proposal for title III funds to set up a teacher training arrangement analogous to the arrangement planned for the Teacher Corps?

3. Have any such proposals under title I or title III been submitted?

4. You cited "mobility" as a key feature that distinguishes the Teacher Corps from a title I or III proposal. Could you again state an example as you did on the phone of what you mean by "mobility"?

I would appreciate your reply to these questions at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: In answer to your letter of March 18, 1966, regarding the Teacher Corps, the following is provided:

1. A group of individual local school districts entitled to financial assistance under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, may elect to have a combined program in cooperation with an institution of higher education that would involve the training of teachers for specific assignments under a title I program to provide for the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. Such a combined project, however, must meet with the approval of the State educational agency.

2. Under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a proposal may also be submitted by a group of school districts for teacher training as an exemplary model for regular school programs. Under the title, the Office of Education is obligated to consult with the State educational agency but final approval rests with the Commissioner of Education.

3. Proposals have been made under both title I and title III for teacher training but in all cases have been limited to the geographical area to be covered by the proposal. In the title III projects, teacher training has been part of a larger program, such as curriculum improvement.

4. The mobility factor involved in the National Teacher Corps that does not have a corollary under titles I and III involves the stimulative effect of a nationwide recruitment and selection effort. The reason for this "mobility" is the fact that those individuals who may wish to join the National Teacher Corps would reside in areas where little need exists, and conversely, those school districts most in need of teachers would have little supply available. It would be our objective to have Teacher Corps members assigned to university training programs in the same locality as the school districts requesting their teaching services. The fiscal year 1966 budget estimate includes an amount of $1,875,000 to pay for the travel costs involved.

Sincerely,

N. KARSH,
Assistant Commissioner for Administration.

HEARING WITH THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, MR. HOWE

SELECTION OF TEACHERS CORPS MEMBERS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS

Mr. LAIRD. The act authorizing a Teachers Corps stipulates that a teacher must be requested by the local school district. Is it true that the local school district can only request teachers who have been previously selected or trained under standards set by the U.S. Commissioner of Education?

Mr. HOWE. It certainly is true, sir, that they will not request specific individuals by name, but rather people who are involved in the program, having been selected under the program.

Mr. LAIRD. Having been selected by you?

Mr. HOWE. Having been selected, yes, by—

Mr. LAIRD. Whoever you delegate the authority to?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Under the law you are the only one who has the responsibility for selecting these individuals.

Mr. HOWE. That is right, and we will run a selection process and screening process.

Mr. LAIRD. And the standards that are established as far as training are standards which you establish?

Mr. HOWE. As far as the training offered in the universities is concerned, yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Isn't it a fact that the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the salaries of the teachers who go into these school districts as members of the Federal Teachers' Corps?

Mr. HOWE. The Government will pay 100 percent of their salaries; yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. How likely is it, if you, as Commissioner, decide to offer teachers who fit your standards but do not fit those of the local school districts, that the local school districts would turn down a 100-percent federally subsidized teacher, even if it means altering their own standards or the curriculum content?

Mr. CARDWELL. Mr. Laird——

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the Commissioner.

Mr. CARDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWE. My guess is that a local school district, because it wanted a teacher, would be willing to take one of the members of the Corps in spite of the fact that there was not an exact fit between its view of what constituted proper training and what training these Teachers Corps members had received. I would guess, however, the problem here is not one of major degree. I think we must remember, in this, that the trainees the local district will receive will be people who have had only a summer's quick exposure and, primarily, an exposure to learning how to work with the youngsters and being with youngsters in a summer institute.

Mr. LAIRD. Let's take an example now. If, we will say, the school district involved teachers old math and you, as Commissioner, decide that the Teacher Corps members would teach new math, what will happen in this case? What if you decide only new math would be taught by the Teacher Corps members?

Mr. HOWE. First of all, we would not get into the kind of detail that sets this sort of arrangement in the curriculum pattern of the summer institute or teacher training classes. We would leave these matters up to the university.

Mr. LAIRD. You already answered my question that you would only offer teachers to those districts that met your standards.

Mr. HOWE. Excuse me, sir. I didn't intend to say that, if I did. I said we would offer teachers to any district that requested them. I thought your question involved just what would happen when a teacher was requested and we came up with a person who had somewhat different training than that district preferred. I think my answer there was that the district would probably take the person because the differences are not likely to be large or even significant.

Mr. LAIRD. In answer to my first question, when I discussed with you whether it was you as U.S. Commissioner that was going to be able to establish the standards, you answered that you were, for all purposes, the person who would establish the standards.

Mr. HOWE. That is right for the training. It is my obligation under the law.

Mr. LAIRD. During periods of service in the Teachers' Corps under the law you still have that responsibility.

Mr. HOWE. The actual work in the school is completely uncontrolled by the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. LAIRD. You are going to establish the standards for these teachers. What if these standards are different standards than the local school district has?

Mr. HOWE. If these are different standards from the local school district, then I think there will be some possibility of not quite as good a fit between the people that are available and the people that the local school district would like to have working for it. But it seems to me that we really depend on the universities who are doing the training job, and the details of what will be offered to these teachers will be set in universities which are in the local areas where the teachers will indeed be teaching. It will be the accustomed kinds of curricula activities that those universities traditionally offer for the service of schools in those areas. We in the U.S. Office are not going to spell out a control of curriculum. We have never done this and certainly have no intention of doing this.

Mr. LAIRD. Are the universities going to set the standards in the areas involved?

Mr. HOWE. I think our problem here is around this matter of "standards." We will require certain proportions of practice teaching, certain times in the classrooms working with youngsters, a certain proportionate time, perhaps, in course work in the university; but the exact detail of the nature of mathematics which is made available in California or New York or wherever will be predominantly set by the teacher training pattern of the university serving these interns in their training process.

Mr. LAIRD. It will be up to the university, then, in the area to set these standards?

Mr. HOWE. Here again the word "standards," I think, is getting in my way. The patterns of training, if these be standards in terms of requirements of time and all, will probably have to be set by us. But the exact subject matter, if that is standards, will have to be set by the universities because they are close to the schools and know what the schools of the local area really require and use.

Mr. LAIRD. I am just not completely clear on that. Perhaps you can clear that question up, Mr. Cardwell. You have been anxious to say something.

Mr. CARDWELL. I would attempt to. I understood your original concern to be directed to the issue of local right of determination as to subject matter to be taught. I think I am interpreting you correctly.

Mr. LAIRD. I am trying to get at what the standards will be as far as the individual in the Teachers Corps is concerned, the educational background, system that is to be used within the school district itself.

Mr. CARDWELL. The law, as you probably know, specifically requires that the local community be assured of the right to determine the subject matter to be taught, what will be taught, how it will be taught, and so forth. As this relates to the issue of teachers' standards and competence, the question is answered in the law, and the Commissioner of Education is bound to execute the law as it is stipulated.

RIGHT OF LOCAL SCHOOL OFFICIALS TO DISMISS CORPS TEACHERS

Mr. LAIRD. It is my understanding that the school district superintendent can fire a Federal teacher, if he wishes, at any time. Is this true?

Mr. HOWE. Yes, although I would qualify this and say this is not really a Federal teacher. It is one of his teachers, he is receiving funds for helping him pay for the teacher, and this is why he can fire the teacher as he can the others he is paying.

Mr. LAIRD. He is 100 percent federally financed as opposed to the local teacher, and I think would be classified as a federally financed teacher. I don't want to quibble over the term, but certainly it would be a Federal teacher as opposed to one that is financed locally.

Mr. HOWE. He can get rid of his trainees or his teachers if they don't serve according to his standards.

Mr. LAIRD. If a teacher is fired, how will it affect his status in the Federal Teachers Corps?

Mr. HOWE. Right now our view of this is that we would be willing to reassign this teacher if we think the person has a chance of success when reassigned. Sometimes the situation in which a teacher will be leaving is more of a problem than the person himself. So we would examine this situation without prejudice and would be willing to try to replace the person if it seemed wise to do so. There is a process of judgment involved here.

QUESTION OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Mr. LAIRD. Isn't it true that the very fact that you, as Commissioner of Education, determine which districts will get the Federal teachers, and the Federal Government pays 100 percent of their salaries, that this creates a situation where the absence of Federal controls will be based solely on your good intensions as U.S. Commissioner of Education?

Mr. HOWE. I don't determine beyond a certain point. I don't give these teachers to anybody who doesn't ask for them. So the original determination is created by the request of the district for a teacher. Secondly, I am required by law to place these teachers in districts which have a fairly high proportion of disadvantaged youngsters. So here again it is not a matter of discretionary determination, but required by law. So it seems to me that I am really not in a determining situation of placing a teacher somewhere; I am making a teacher available to a place which has asked for one.

Mr. LAIRD. Don't you think this is quite an incentive—a hundred percent of the financing of the teacher's salary—to a local school district?

Mr. HOWE. Yes, I do, indeed. Yet we must keep in mind, in regarding this as an incentive, that this does not take away any of the cost of that school's regular operation, because this is a supplementary, additional service above what the school district regularly supplies.

BROAD ELIGIBILITY OF SCHOOLS TO PARTICIPATE

Mr. LAIRD. Every school is going to have to increase its educational offering because the schools are growing. So there is no school that would not qualify under the criteria you just used. Every school has had to expand its educational program.

Mr. HOWE. Right.

Mr. LAIRD. There is no school in America that would not qualify under the definition you just used.

Mr. HOWE. This would enrich the program of any school.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes.

Mr. HOWE. Absolutely.

Mr. LAIRD. So there is no school in America that should not be interested in having a Federal teacher where they get the whole salary paid.

Mr. HOWE. This is really a matter of local determination. I suspect there will be various feelings about this, and some will not apply.

Mr. LAIRD. They are going to have to increase their teaching personnel. Why wouldn't they want a Federal teacher?

Mr. HOWE. I can't examine their motives on this, but I do know there are school systems which are not accepting aid under title II of the Elementary-Secondary Act out of their own desire not to have it. I assume this same thing will happen with this particular program.

Mr. LAIRD. In other words, they might make this determination because they feel that you, as commissioner of education, might be in a position to influence, or control, the curriculum content or other facets of local education. Wouldn't that be the basis on which they make that determination?

Mr. HOWE. I would expect individual school systems might have people with that feeling, but I would regard the feeling as completely unjustified.

Mr. LAIRD. You do possess, under this act, all of the power you need to give the local school districts a choice of either "all I prescribe or nothing" as far as the Federal teacher is concerned.

Mr. HOWE. If I were to try to figure out how to use this act to control the schools, I really think I would have a hard time doing it.

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS WHERE DEMAND EXCEEDS SUPPLY

Mr. LAIRD. You are not going to be able to fulfill all of the requests for these Federal teachers, are you?

Mr. HOWE. That is right.

Mr. LAIRD. Because you are going to pay 100 percent of their salaries. This just stands to reason. Anyone can understand it, I think, if you are going to go in and pay 100 percent of the salary.

Mr. HOWE. This is why I think the act directs me to place the teachers where there are the largest proportion of disadvantaged youngsters.

Mr. LAIRD. But you are going to be in a position here where you can do certain favors for some school districts and not for others, and you are going to favor those school districts that follow the program of education that you feel is the proper program.

Mr. HOWE. No, sir. I don't think that I have any feeling about what program they ought to be following. I think my effort here, really, as determined by the act, is going to be to try to decide rationally who has the greatest need in terms of services to disadvantaged youngsters.

Mr. LAIRD. That's a personal opinion, a personal decision you make.

Mr. HOWE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. That decision is not made on the basis of any calculation that can be made, it is a human decision.

Mr. HOWE. Of course, we all know these decisions are not made personally by the Commissioner. They are made by a process the Commissioner establishes which prevents them from being personal decisions, and which brings advisory people and continued committee consultation into the process of decisionmaking.

MECHANICS FOR PAYING TEACHERS

Mr. LAIRD. We have talked about it, and it is established that the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the salaries of the Federal teachers assigned to the local school districts.

Mr. HOWE. Right.

Mr. LAIRD. How does the Federal Government actually pay these salaries—directly to the teachers involved or to the local school boards?

Mr. KARSH. They would be paid on a reimbursable basis. The local school boards would pay the salary of the interns and experienced teachers, and we would reimburse the school boards.

Mr. LAIRD. You would pay directly to the school boards and not to the State department of public instruction?

Mr. KARSH. That is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. And they would make the disbursements to the individual Federal teachers?

Mr. KARSH. Yes.

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS TO SCHOOLS

Mr. LAIRD. We have already established that you have the sole authority to decide which school districts will get these Federal teachers.

Mr. HOWE. In terms of their requests and in terms of the provision of the act regarding disadvantaged children, yes. These are the guidelines.

Mr. LAIRD. Those are the only guidelines?

Mr. HOWE. As far as I know, within the framework of the definition of disadvantaged youngsters under the Elementary-Secondary Act, yes.

CONTROL OF TEACHERS AFTER ASSIGNMENT

Mr. LAIRD. Once a Federal teacher is assigned to the local school district he will be subject to all the rules and regulations of the local school district.

Mr. HOWE. He will be a local school teacher and subject to all the rules and regulations.

Mr. LAIRD. Isn't it true that the local school district must make "arrangements" for the use and development of such teachers with you as Commissioner of Education?

Mr. HOWE. Yes. There will be, certainly, plans for the effective use both of the teachers in training and the expert teachers to provide the training. These will be plans for which we will provide guidelines.

ROLE OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Mr. LAIRD. You completely bypass the State departments of education as far as the Teachers Corps program is concerned?

Mr. HOWE. I believe we are told in the act to consult with them. I will have to find the reference.

Mr. LAIRD. I think you can have a discussion with them, but as far as any actual contact——

Mr. HOWE. It says "consultation in appropriate cases with State educational agencies and institutions of higher education."

Mr. LAIRD. But they have no authority to recommend which district within a State should receive a Federal teacher?

Mr. HOWE. No authority as such.

Mr. LAIRD. That authority rest only with you as U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Mr. HOWE. Again, within the qualifications we have discussed——

Mr. LAIRD. Yes.

Mr. HOWE (continuing). Of requests and the category of youngsters to be served.

Mr. LAIRD. As we look down the road, doesn't this principle, coupled with similar provisions in other educational programs, such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, really set the stage for the eventual replacement of State direction of education by the Federal Government.

Mr. HOWE. I would say not. I would say the Elementary and Secondary Act probably does more to build up the direction of education by State governments than it does the opposite. In fact, I would assert that it does.

Two specific items under this generalization: One, the fact that the largest piece of money in the Elementary and Secondary Act is awarded at the discretion of the State superintendents of instruction under title I of that act. And item two, the fact that the act provides funds for the strengthening of State departments of education through title V.

Mr. LAIRD. You don't think they are qualified to handle the Federal teacher program?

Mr. HOWE. I didn't say that. I said we are simply providing funds to strengthen them. I think we will consult State departments of education.

Mr. LAIRD. Would you object if we put language in this appropriation act that would limit the assignment of these Federal teachers to those school districts as recommended by the State departments of public instruction?

Mr. HOWE. I would be concerned about this, first of all, in terms of timing. If we must now start negotiating with 50 States and set up systems for assignment, I think we have got an additional job here.

Mr. LAIRD. Wouldn't this be easier than negotiating directly with thousands of school boards throughout the United States?

Mr. HOWE. I don't know, really, because I haven't had a chance to look into it.

Mr. LAIRD. You want to go directly to thousands of school districts throughout the United States and bypass the 50 States. If you could deal with the 50 State departments—and we assume they are becoming stronger. At least, Commissioner Keppel testified last year of the progress that was being made. I think we should be able to put a little faith and trust in these State departments.

Mr. HOWE. We certainly try to put faith and trust in them and work closely with them. It seems to me that we may run into difficulties with such an assignment to State departments, depending on how it is arranged.

Mr. LAIRD. But you personally would rather go to each of the school districts?

Mr. HOWE. No, I have no objection in principle to being involved in a planning relationship with State departments of education to get this job done. I am hesitating about it because I am thinking of the plans we have already tried to make, and of shifting gears between now and next June in a very complex program.

Mr. LAIRD. How many school districts have you made plans with? It just doesn't seem to me you have had any authority to make any plans with any school district. You haven't had any money.

Mr. HOWE. We haven't made plans with school districts.

STATUS OF PLANNING FOR THE PROGRAM

Mr. LAIRD. What plans have you made? Let's get this out on the table here. For the first time I hear these plans have been made. How were they financed?

Mr. HOWE. We were authorized to go ahead with planning activities and money for this purpose has been authorized.

Mr. LAIRD. When was that authorized?

Mr. CARDWELL. Under "Salaries and expenses" in the appropriation. The specific request was approved.

Mr. LAIRD. Where in the justification for the 1966 budget is it?

Mr. CARDWELL. I can insert it in the record, sir.

Mr. KARSH. In the 1966 budget under "Salaries and expenses," specifically identified.

Mr. LAIRD. For the Teachers' Corps?

Mr. KARSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. What page of the justification is that?

Mr. CARDWELL. We can insert it.

Mr. LAIRD. How many people were assigned?

Mr. KARSH. Sixty were identified. We have not hired any of those 60.

Mr. LAIRD. You haven't hired any. Who has been doing all of this planning with the school districts for teachers? I would like to find this out, if it is such a big problem to retrace and go to the State departments of public instruction. If you have made all of these contacts and have all of this planning going, I would like to know about it.

Mr. HOWE. We have not made elaborate contacts with school districts. We have, however, developed a number of policy statements and have developed tentative guidelines which we have in the printing process, and this kind of thing, so that we can get this program launched if it is approved. I can't answer honestly whether a reshuffle here would cause us major complexities or not. I would like to ask Mr. Zellers, who has been doing the detailed work in some of the planning for this program, to say a word about what a shift involving State departments might create for us.

Mr. KARSH. Before he does, I would like to say that Mr. Zellers is detailed from his current position as executive officer in one of our bureaus, the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, to work on the development of the Teachers' Corps.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Commissioner, first I would just like to say I am just trying to develop this to see why it is such a big problem to

shift to a limitation in the appropriation which would provide funds only would be available for Federal teachers as approved by the State departments of public instruction. When I get an answer that this has gone so far, then I find that none of the 60 people have been hired. I am trying to figure out how this has gone so far, how it was financed. I think it is a legitimate question to ask.

Mr. HOWE. Certainly. It is authorized, as has been stated, and we will put into the record the exact authorization for this.

Mr. LAIRD. But you say you haven't hired any of these people.

Mr. HOWE. We have detailed people within our staff to this activity—and this has involved a considerable amount of work—in order to get into the posture of being able to move if it is authorized.

Mr. LAIRD. Let's hear from Mr. Zellers.

EFFECT IF PROGRAM CHANGED TO DEAL THROUGH STATES

Mr. ZELLERS. I think the only answer I can give on that, Mr. Laird, is if the change were made today, right now, we could probably shift our program in the direction of working with the States and launch the program just as rapidly as if we were working directly with local educational agencies. But if the amendment has to go through a long process, the program is going to be delayed.

Mr. LAIRD. How much would you save as far as administrative expense if you dealt with 50 State departments of public instruction instead of dealing with thousands upon thousands of school districts all over the United States?

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS TO PARTICIPATE

Mr. ZELLERS. We are not going to deal with thousands and thousands. We are thinking in terms of approximately 300 or 400.

Mr. LAIRD. You are only going into 300 or 400?

Mr. ZELLERS. This is all we are going to be able to fund the first year.

Mr. LAIRD. In answer to Chairman Fogarty's question a little earlier, we were told this was merely a start, and once you start this program won't it get up to thousands of school districts?

Mr. ZELLERS. This depends upon the size of the appropriations.

Mr. LAIRD. It would seem to me you would have requests from thousands of school districts. Seems to me that 90 percent of the school districts in the country will go for a Federal teacher when you have 100 percent of the salary being paid for. And it would seem to me, although you are only funding 300 or 400 school districts, perhaps, under this request, you are going to have to deal with thousands of them. Aren't you going to have to investigate each request?

Mr. ZELLERS. The best estimate we have until we have a year's experience is that around 1,500 will be interested.

Mr. LAIRD. Only 1,500 will request, and you will narrow that down to 300 or 400?

Mr. ZELLERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. So my statement of thousands is wrong; it should be 1,500.

Mr. FOGARTY. 1,500 out of how many eligible?

Mr. LAIRD. How many are eligible in all of the United States?

Mr. ZELLERS. We don't know how many. It isn't a question of how many are eligible. There are some 20,000 school districts in the country.

Mr. LAIRD. And you only think 1,500 will apply?

Mr. ZELLERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. For 100-percent Federal financing of Federal teachers?

Mr. ZELLERS. Mainly because the initial announcement will contain the information that they have to have a high concentration of children from disadvantaged families located in specific schools in order to qualify.

Mr. LAIRD. As this program expands you are going to have to deal with thousands.

Mr. ZELLERS. As the program expands, of course, any prediction you want to make might be a possibility.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you really want to deal directly with all of these school districts around the United States? Is this one way of establishing the standards from Washington in these various school districts? Why do you want to deal directly with these school districts? There must be some reason.

Mr. ZELLERS. I haven't made the decision to deal directly with them. The statute contains that provision. I have no objection to dealing directly with the States.

Mr. LAIRD. That answers my question.

DRAFT OF NOTIFICATION TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. FOGARTY. What about the notification you are going to send out to the school districts? Do you have that ready now?

Mr. ZELLERS. We have draft letters to go to chief State school officers and to local school districts.

Mr. FOGARTY. May we have a copy? May we see a copy of it?

Mr. ZELLERS. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. May we put a draft in the record at this point, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, I think it would be a good thing.

(The information follows:)

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,

"Washington, D.C.

"Draft.

"State Superintendent.

"DEAR SIR: You are asked to join us in planning and carrying out a program which can have considerable impact on the education of our Nation's impoverished youth.

"The National Teacher Corps is designed to bring able teaching aid to those schools which need specially equipped personnel to assist with the education of disadvantaged youth. Under this program, experienced teachers and teams of teachers, composed of experienced teachers and teacher-interns, will be recruited and trained in teaching the disadvantaged.

"Each school district in your State is being sent detailed information for formulating project proposals. These proposals will be submitted simultaneously to the National Teacher Corps and the district's State education agency.

"Your assistance is sought in several areas: first, local education agencies are to send copies of project proposals to you which we would want to evaluate; second, we request that you identify local school districts particularly in need of help and then provide them advice in developing proposals; finally, we would hope that you could use your agency's resources to bring this program to to the attention of eligible teachers.

"As you can readily see, your cooperation is crucial to the effective operation of this program. Any advice or assistance that you may provide us will be greatly appreciated. The staff of the National Teachers Corps will be glad to discuss any aspects of the program and supply you with additional information.

"Sincerely yours,

"_____,

"U.S. Commissioner of Education.

"Write or call National Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D.C., 20202, Area Code 202-963-5266."

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,

"Washington, D.C.

"Draft.

"Superintendent of Schools.

"DEAR SIR: You may wish to join us in planning and carrying out a program which can have considerable impact on the education of our Nation's impoverished youth.

"The National Teacher Corps is designed to bring able teaching aid to those schools which need specially equipped personnel to assist with the education of disadvantaged youth. Under this new program experienced teachers and teams of teachers, composed of experienced teachers and teacher-interns, will be recruited and trained for work in local school districts requesting them. Selected Corps teachers will receive 3 months of training in teaching the disadvantaged before actual assignment to schools where the need for special assistance is greatest.

"The enclosed information includes a detailed description of the program and a form for requesting additional materials for developing a project proposal. Your prompt consideration is necessary to insure adequate planning for the initial year of the program, since the project proposals must be received by the National Teacher Corps no later than (date to be inserted).

"Sincerely yours,

"_____,

"U.S. Commissioner of Education.

"Write or call National Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., Washington, D.C., 20202, Area Code 202-963-5266."

"NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS DESCRIPTIVE MATERIAL

"PURPOSE

"The National Teacher Corps (NTC) administered by the U.S. Office of Education, assists school systems in areas of urban and rural poverty, to obtain teaching talent.

"As established under part B, title V, of the Higher Education Act, NTC encourages experienced teachers and teacher-interns to serve in areas where they are most needed. It attracts able and dedicated young people into the teaching profession and provides an opportunity for experienced teachers to broaden their skills. It also encourages colleges and universities to broaden their teacher preparation programs to include the kind of training necessary for the successful teaching of disadvantaged students.

"PROGRAM

"Members of the NTC will supplement, not replace, regular school staff. They will be utilized in a great variety of ways, both within the school and within the community. They will serve as teachers, relieving regular staff members of some of their burdens. They will, in some instances, develop special curriculum programs. They will undertake projects that a school has not had the opportunity to develop. They will provide extra guidance and counseling. They will work with the families of students, with courts, welfare agencies, health clinics, and with other institutions that are involved in the total development of a youngster.

"In most instances, NTC members will operate as teams with an experienced teacher serving as team leader for a group of three or four teacher-interns. In some instances, experienced teachers will be assigned to schools as individuals.

"Programs will be locally operated but will be financed by the Federal Government. It is expected that each program will operate for a 2-year period.

Law 874 and that was answered in the affirmative.

Mr. CARDWELL. The chairman of this committee quite recently asked that question and I think the answer was in the negative.

Mr. LAIRD. I am talking about the hearings on the 1966 bill. You defended that estimate as adequate to fund 100 percent. Mr. Kelly who is sitting right here was at the hearings that day. He insisted that 100-percent financing was provided in that estimate that came to this committee. He did not hedge on that estimate.

Mr. KELLY. When we appeared before the committee last year, it was our best judgment that the estimate that we presented for your consideration would pay 100-percent entitlement.

Mr. LAIRD. Every school district in the United States that operates under 874 is expecting 100-percent financing?

Mr. KELLY. Two things occurred. First, the developments indicated that our estimate was wrong both as to numbers of students eligible and as to average cost per student. Second, the Congress changed the law and modified it so as to provide certain liberalizations which would require additional funds.

As Mr. Cardwell said, because the administration is proposing to the Congress that it amend the law, and these amendments to the law would substantially reduce the amounts of funds required for these school districts, it was decided not to request a supplemental to finance 100-percent entitlement in 1966. It was believed that this would aggravate the situation rather than assist it.

Mr. FOGARTY. The question Mr. Laird asked was answered by you. I did ask the question and I ask it every year.

Mr. KELLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOGARTY. "Are these sufficient funds to cover 100 percent of what these districts are entitled to under the law?" The answer I remember was in the affirmative.

Mr. KELLY. That is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. You have decided as Commissioner of Education that these funds are not needed?

Mr. HOWE. I would not put it exactly that way.

Mr. LAIRD. What have you decided? You have not asked for them. What have you decided?

Mr. HOWE. It seems to me, since we are making a transition to a different program under Public Law 874, with somewhat lower funding, that to move ahead with larger funding is just asking for a greater disparity when we go to the new program; and that therefore it makes sense to taper this off on a pro rata basis.

Mr. LAIRD. To go under this new program requires an act of Congress.

Mr. HOWE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right. It is not "somewhat lower funding"; it is a cut of over 50 percent. What do you call "somewhat?"

Mr. LAIRD. You are taking this upon yourself to amend the law rather than wait for Congress to act, by refusing to come to the Congress with a request? You feel that these funds are not needed?

Mr. HOWE. It seems to me in terms of the total program that we are trying to advance that this kind of supplemental would simply create a greater contrast when we got into the new program.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you not think you have a commitment to these school districts that is even a prior commitment as compared with Federal teachers?

Mr. HOWE. Actually I have not had these things in my mind as being set against each other.

Mr. LAIRD. The only reason they are in the same ball park is that they are in the form of supplementals. This is a supplemental request we have here. There is a supplemental that should be asked for if we are going to live up to the 100-percent commitment that Mr. Kelly and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education said they were requesting for fiscal year 1966. Every school district that is under that particular program felt that they were going to get 100 percent, after the testimony that was given to this committee, and given to the U.S. Senate.

I have serious questions about the program but I don't have questions about what commitment was made. I think that you—and I am talking about your predecessor and the Office of Education as well as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—did indicate that you were favoring 100-percent financing in fiscal year 1966.

I would like to know how or what kind of rationale you can use to get out of that commitment.

Mr. HOWE. You mean 100-percent financing in 874?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes.

Mr. HOWE. The only rationale that I can give you is the one that I just stated. In terms of our plan this seemed to make sense.

Mr. LAIRD. I guess I will not pursue it any more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think you ought to. I go along with you on this, as you know. I think they are all wrong. I think the administration is entirely wrong in this thing. I think that the Commissioner of Education knows they are wrong.

Mr. LAIRD. It seems to me they are establishing a priority and this commitment would seem to be a prior commitment as far as supplementals are concerned. I think they have committed themselves to these school districts by their testimony before this committee last year on the 1966 budget.

Mr. HOWE. We have so stated in years past that we made these commitments and we requested funds.

Mr. LAIRD. I do not want to ask any more questions.

Mr. FOGARTY. Take your time. We want to give this a good hearing today.

Mr. LAIRD. Thank you.

Mr. FOGARTY. What about the land grant colleges?

Mr. LAIRD. I have gotten into enough today. This just amazes me, that this comes in the form of a supplemental in this way. When they turned their back on the school districts to whom they had previously made a firm commitment all over the United States. They want to fund the Federal teachers program ahead of these firm commitments they made to these school districts all over the United States.

Mr. FOGARTY. I made a pledge to the President that I would try to get this supplemental through the committee. We will get it reported out. I hope that you will support me on that and also in taking care of this shortage for Public Law 874.

Mr. Duncan?

Mr. DUNCAN. I have just a few questions. More than anything else directed toward clarifying the cross-examination that was just gone through here.

As I understand your final question——

Mr. LAIRD. I was just asking questions here. I hate to have it referred to as cross-examination.

Mr. DUNCAN. You will certainly allow the same latitude of characterizing your questioning as you demand for yourself in characterizing the actions of these witnesses, would you not?

It was good cross-examination. As I understand it, it boils down to this: Basically your program and your request here is to fund the law as it was passed by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. HOWE. That is correct, with the reservation that we are asking for a somewhat lower level of funding than was authorized in the law.

OPINIONS ON REQUIRING LOCAL MATCHING

Mr. DUNCAN. I understand that. Insofar as the law itself was concerned, your requests are consistent, if not with the position taken by the department of education on prior occasions, at least with the final action of the Congress of the United States in the authorizing legislation?

Mr. HOWE. Absolutely.

Mr. DUNCAN. Then I would understand further, however, that as the head of the department, you have no objection to putting this program on a matching fund basis?

Mr. HOWE. In the long run, none at all in principle.

Mr. DUNCAN. We understand that the position of the department last year was not a long-run position but it was their position at that time that they wanted matching funds at the outset of the program?

Mr. HOWE. I assume that and not having been directly involved in that I cannot speak for that 100 percent.

Mr. DUNCAN. Let me ask Mr. Kelly. The position of the department while the legislation was under consideration was that it should have been a matching fund program?

Mr. KELLY. I think so. But it was anticipated that the enactment of the legislation this way would have been the advanced notice to the school district.

DURATION OF PROGRAM

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you conceive of this Teachers Corps program as being a permanent program or an emergency program of less than permanent duration?

Mr. HOWE. I would think of it myself as a program of some length. "Permanent" is quite a word. I would consider it as a program that would have 10 or 15 years' life and be reexamined from time to time.

Mr. DUNCAN. You do not consider it to be in any way a temporary program, a temporary boost to encourage the local school districts to supply a higher level of teaching both in quantity and quality, and being a program from which the Federal Government could withdraw?

Mr. HOWE. The reason I give the answer I do is that it ought to have considerable longevity and that I honestly don't believe we are going to handle the problem at which it is directed in the short run.

This is the problem of the disadvantaged youngsters in both urban and rural slums.

RELATIONSHIP OF LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS TO STATE AGENCIES

Mr. DUNCAN. Are not most school districts in the United States independent of the State departments of education? Do they not operate with a considerable degree of autonomy?

Mr. HOWE. There are varying degrees of autonomy from State to State. It varies a great deal.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is there a geographical pattern to this variation?

Mr. HOWE. I never thought about it in these terms. I would say that in New England the tradition of local independence of the school system from the State is probably of longer run and it is a more vigorous local tradition than in some other places. Actually, it probably could be measured by looking at the percentage of State funding for schools, and you would probably find the degree of autonomy related to a large extent to the proportion of local money provided as opposed to State money. I cannot give you a geographical distribution beyond that statement about New England——

RELATIONSHIP OF GRANT FUNDS AND LOCAL AUTONOMY

Mr. DUNCAN. The more State money that goes into the local school districts, the less autonomy they enjoy?

Mr. HOWE. I think this is a fair statement.

Mr. DUNCAN. Would that same analogy hold true, you think, with regard to Federal money going to school districts?

Mr. HOWE. If you were to ever get into the posture of having the proportions involved of Federal money that are involved in the State-local relationship, you might want to raise this issue. The proportions involved are so minor and will be for so long that I hardly think we confront the issue in those terms.

TOTAL FUNDS FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. DUNCAN. What are we talking about in terms of the total amount of money spent on primary and secondary education in the United States? Is it $40 billion a year?

Mr. HOWE. I have heard figures ranging from $25 to $40 billion. It is in that baillwick.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you know how much Federal money is going currently into primary and secondary education in the country now?

Mr. HOWE. Roughly two and a half——

Mr. KARSH. $2.5 to $3 billion from all Federal sources.

Mr. DUNCAN. Not only the Department of Education, but all the departments of Government?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. I had heard of the $40 billion figure.

Mr. HOWE. I think the $40 billion figure is probably a figure that is more inclusive than just elementary and secondary. I think they will run nearer to $25 and $28 billion.

Mr. DUNCAN. At the present time somewhere between $2.5 billion to $3 billion Federal money is going into that?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. I cannot remember the precise percentage of State funds that go to school systems in Oregon but I do not think it is much more than 30. I am likewise satisfied that a high degree of autonomy is enjoyed by the school districts in Oregon.

EXTENT OF ELIGIBILITY FOR CORPS TEACHERS

You have indicated that with the amounts of money requested here that you would not have funds to make available to all schools districts in the country. As I gather the testimony, all school districts in the country perhaps would have eligibility. Is that last assumption a correct one?

Mr. HOWE. Not all school districts in the country will have eligibility.

Mr. DUNCAN. Most of them? 90 percent of them?

Mr. HOWE. The eligibility factor here is a comparative matter related to the numbers, or proportions of disadvantaged youngsters, so that there will be a focus of eligibility in relatively few.

Mr. DUNCAN. Every school district will have some disadvantaged youngsters?

Mr. HOWE. If the funds were to be built up to a very large program you would then get into larger numbers of school districts.

Mr. DUNCAN. Where do you suppose the major impact of this initial appropriation would be?

Mr. HOWE. It would be first of all in certain States. We have got some figures here that show that some 20 States have 80 percent of the disadvantaged youngsters. Therefore, you can bet that within these 20 States you would have considerable focus of this.

Secondly, you would have a relatively high focus in the South and in certain urban areas.

Mr. DUNCAN. Harlem, for instance?

Mr. HOWE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. Watts?

Mr. HOWE. I am not sure of California in this picture. They are relatively high in this category. Very high.

Mr. DUNCAN. Some of these areas are rather critical from a social standpoint right now, are they not? Harlem and Watts, for example?

Mr. HOWE. Absolutely. The States that have the largest numbers of disadvantaged youngsters are Texas, California, North Carolina, and then New York giving this as a quick reading.

Mr. DUNCAN. North Carolina is the only Southern State you read in that list?

Mr. HOWE. I am giving the top of the list.

Mr. DUNCAN. Read a half dozen more.

Mr. HOWE. South Carolina, picking up Southern States, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Tennessee, Florida, Kentucky, Virginia, are all on this listing of States with very large numbers of disadvantaged youngsters.

Mr. DUNCAN. What State did you come from to the Department?

Mr. HOWE. I came from North Carolina. I have been there only 2 years so I am not a real Tar Heel.

Mr. DUNCAN. We are actually, initially at least, talking about trying to get some funds in the most disadvantaged areas of the country and those areas particularly where we have had rather graphic examples of social unrest in the last few months.

Mr. HOWE. Yes, that is right. Getting them there for a particular purpose.

Mr. DUNCAN. Would basically these school districts be those with a pattern of colored students, Puerto Rican, Negro.

Mr. HOWE. There would be a high proportion of Negro youngsters in the communities involved. Puerto Rican only in a few places, of course.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you find even in a wealthy State such as California, for instance, which generally has a high level of support for its schools, there are school districts occupying a different status and that have a tax base so low which even when combined with State support makes it unlikely that they would furnish the quality and quantity of teachers demanded by the local neighborhood?

Mr. HOWE. You have got to qualify the answer to this by asking whether the teacher training institutions in California are training teachers with the kind of focus with which this program is concerned—really training them in their practice teaching and all their background work to work with disadvantaged youngsters. This program really focuses on that.

FUNCTION OF CORPS TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS TO WHICH ASSIGNED

Mr. DUNCAN. These teachers will be actually handling special classes as opposed to moving in and assuming a parallel function of teachers already hired?

Mr. HOWE. These teachers will be providing what you might describe as supplementary additional services in the schools rather than taking over regular classes. These teachers will not be relieving the school system of any costs. They will be providing additional services, such as remedial reading—special small group services over and above what the school system normally provides.

Mr. DUNCAN. They would not go in to relieve a lot of students in a course in new math, for instance? Assume a situation where they have got 45 students per teacher. You would not plan to use these teachers simply to improve the teacher-pupil ratio?

Mr. HOWE. They might be used to improve the pupil-teacher ratio for groups of youngsters who have special needs. Perhaps new math is not a good example because the chances are that new math would not be focused on disadvantaged youngsters.

Take the realm of reading, or social studies, or English classrooms in the junior high school—I think that these teachers might well be used to cut down division size to give the regular teachers a smaller group to work with on a more intensive basis while they were supervising other activities with a portion of the group.

Mr. DUNCAN. In each instance they follow the curriculum and follow the texts used by other teachers?

Mr. HOWE. Absolutely.

COMPLAINTS REGARDING FEDERAL CONTROL

Mr. DUNCAN. Have you had complaints as you have been administering your programs of assistance to the primary and secondary schools of the country about Federal control of the educational processes in those States?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. You have had some?

Mr. HOWE. On a regular basis.

Mr. DUNCAN. In any quantity?

Mr. HOWE. I wouldn't say in large quantity, no.

I think you have a genuine concern on the part of people in local areas, as they try to get involved in our programs, that our programs not control what they do. We are trying to run our program in ways to avoid this. But we are a new element in the picture so that the concern does get expressed and we receive it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is this concern as to prospective acts of the Department or current procedures?

Mr. HOWE. I think sometimes it is a concern about current procedures in the sense that people will feel that the applications we make them fill out in order to get grants of Federal funds are complex. We are endeavoring to repair these kinds of problems. But there are those, I am sure, who look way ahead and wonder where we are heading with this.

Mr. DUNCAN. Can you describe some of the other complaints? I do not want complaints from persons acting in their individual capacities. I am thinking about complaints from school board members, teachers, departments of education, and so on. I am curious as to the nature these may take.

Mr. HOWE. If I can make an observation about these, I think that one of the great sources of complaint that we receive stems from our civil rights activity and not our program activity. I think that the complaint very easily gets transferred over from feelings about the civil rights activity to the program activity. To the degree that is the case it seems to me that the complaint is not legitimate because the nature or our responsibility in the realm of civil rights is very different from the nature of our responsibility in administering programs.

It is a legal responsibility to enforce certain kinds of things.

Mr. DUNCAN. Without suggesting anything as to the validity of those, do you have complaints about programs?

Mr. HOWE. I think the concerns about programs are those which come from people whom we have turned down for grants, and there is the natural disappointment of having done some work and not getting the grant they hoped to get. Sometimes this generates complaints. I think rarely are these complaints justified. We do a lot of work going back over the ground trying to explain to people why the decisions were reached—what was wrong with the submissions they gave us, how they can improve them and resubmit them. We get complaints about specific submissions.

We do get complaints about procedures that we require. We walk a very difficult line between trying to have enough procedures to guarantee that we are spending Federal funds fairly and wisely, and little enough procedures so that we don't annoy the people with whom we are dealing.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you have complaints that you are imposing restrictions on curriculums, for instance, or types of textbooks used?

Mr. HOWE. We have this question raised but I have never known it to assume the status of a complaint that had any evidence connected with it.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you in fact assert any jurisdiction, real or fancied, over what textbooks are to be used?

Mr. HOWE. No, we can make a very good case that the activities of the U.S. office in the realm of curriculums really confront the

school districts with more choices than have been available to them in past years.

Our whole effort is in the realm of a pluralism of curriculums rather than a single control.

POSSIBILITY OF DEALING THROUGH STATE AGENCIES ON TEACHER CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. DUNCAN. In view of the nature of the school districts to which these initial funds at least would be directed, is there any problem to be anticipated, if the State board of education were to have a voice between the department and the school district insofar as getting the funds to the disadvantaged youngster is concerned?

Mr. HOWE. I don't think any real problem. We are doing this already in title I of the Elementary-Secondary Act. The only concern that I expressed about this in the earlier testimony was the problem of our shifting gears on a plan. I think that with that reservation there certainly is the possibility of having States submit plans or develop programs which we then use as a basis for farming out to them much of the activity involved here.

Mr. DUNCAN. There has been no question in your mind insofar as State plans submitted so far under other aspects of this bill that the funds are getting to the area they are intended to go.

I am thinking, for instance, of problems if California should submit a plan that should exclude Watts, for instance, not that I think they would.

Mr. HOWE. This is why I suggested if we were to move into this relationship with the States on the Teachers Corps program, we would want to have a relationship which involved State planning that had been approved before we went ahead to transfer funds. We would ask that that plan be of such a nature it would include a district like Watts.

INCREASE IN TEACHER SUPPLY THROUGH TEACHER TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. DUNCAN. You are not really creating a new teacher for this program, are you?

Mr. HOWE. I think we are.

Mr. DUNCAN. How?

Mr. HOWE. By setting up a program which in its first days brings some 2,700 people who are not now teaching into training work in the schools, offering supplementary services. We foresee that a high proportion of these will leave the program in 2 years with teaching certificates. What proportion we cannot tell you until we have the experience.

Mr. DUNCAN. These are people who would not have graduated from a teacher training course or a major in education. They would have graduated with a major in some other discipline?

Mr. HOWE. They will in all likelihood, in high proportion, be people defined as you define them.

Mr. DUNCAN. How are these people going to acquire certificates? Are not those certificating agencies pretty rigid in the requirements for educational courses a teacher has before he is eligible for a certificate?

Mr. HOWE. Certification is a State matter entirely. It varies from State to State. The 2-year period in which these people will be in training will have built into it certain course work in addition to their actual work in the schools. So they will have opportunity to pick up certification if they wish to do so. We have not gotten the complete details of this worked out yet but that will certainly be one possibility for the people.

Mr. DUNCAN. This will have to vary from State to State?

Mr. HOWE. There will be some variation from State to State. We would hope there would be real variations in the teacher training programs that are approved at different universities. This is because we are not sure that anyone has the magic formula by which you train people to work with disadvantaged youngsters. We would like to see several approaches to this.

Mr. DUNCAN. Actually you are going to have minimum training before you put them on the job?

Mr. HOWE. They will have this summer which is a "quickie" and then there will be on-the-job intensive supervision with master teachers in the program.

Mr. DUNCAN. Are there any problems in the State teachers organizations in permitting these interns to come into the schools?

Mr. HOWE. I have not heard of them. I would like to ask Mr. Zellers if he had any reaction on this.

Mr. ZELLERS. We have not had any reaction. We have a meeting with that group this week and I will know more early next week than today on that subject.

Mr. DUNCAN. Do you plan to use any retired teachers in this program?

Mr. HOWE. The focus is certainly going to be on training relatively young teachers who have a career before them. There will be some additional focus on getting housewives who are bachelor degree graduates, maybe about 35 to 40 years old, to come into the program. I would expect we would use retired teachers only in the master-teacher category if they are capable and alert people.

Mr. DUNCAN. I think that is all.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Michel?

BASIC GOALS OF PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. Commissioner, what is the real thrust of this program? Is it to get more people interested in teaching? Is it to improve the level or quality of the teaching profession? Is it to expand the effort in the disadvantaged kids of this country? I confess from the colloquy this afternoon I do not know what is the real thrust of it is.

You talk of training people, about training the already trained, the already educated. I thought the real thrust of this program was to help those poor devils who are not getting the very rudiments and fundamentals the way they should. What is the thrust of this program?

Mr. HOWE. The real thrust of this program is to serve disadvantaged youngsters by training teachers specifically in the schools working with them.

Mr. MICHEL. Has the educational process in this country and the institutions fallen down in properly educating people for the teaching profession?

Mr. HOWE. I wouldn't offer it in as broad a generalization as that. I would say we have fallen down in preparing people to really do a constructive job of teaching with the kind of kids who have disadvantaged backgrounds.

CALIBER OF TEACHERS IN PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. How in the devil, if we have been lacking in this area thus far, can you expect to take a trainee with 3 months of training, not prepared with education hours, and thrust him into a situation as you have described and say you are giving the disadvantaged kid a better education than he was getting before?

Mr. HOWE. Personally——

Mr. MICHEL. To me, I do not know. You are the Commissioner of Education. Tell me where I am wrong.

Mr. HOWE. First of all, the trainee is providing a supplementary service to the regular teachers in the school over and above what that youngster would have had if the trainee were not there. This is an additional service. Secondly, the trainee is under the supervision of an experienced teacher assigned there for the purpose of helping to develop both training and the quality of teaching.

Mr. MICHEL. In effect what you are doing is using disadvantaged children as guinea pigs for somebody in practice teaching?

Mr. HOWE. In part this is true. We believe that probably the best way to learn to teach disadvantaged youngsters is to teach disadvantaged youngsters under intensive supervision and criticism. You can never learn to teach disadvantaged youngsters by teaching other kinds of youngsters. You can never learn the kind of adjustment needed by the teacher, if you don't actually confront the person you are worried about in the classroom. This is the basis on which this program is set up.

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR OPERATING PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. Have the rules and regulations been promulgated yet that apply to the Teachers Corps?

Mr. HOWE. They have not been promulgated. There has been some preliminary work on them. If you want to go into details of that, I would ask Mr. Zellers to speak about them.

Mr. MICHEL. I would like to know how soon we could have these rules and regulations in printed form.

Mr. ZELLERS. They are in a working draft form now with about two more chapters to go. Within 2 or 3 weeks we expect to have them in final draft form for the Commissioner's action.

Mr. MICHEL. There was a request made for the record here for an item in draft form. What was it?

Mr. ZELLERS. This was a letter to the chief State school officers announcing the program.

Mr. MICHEL. That is all we have asked for the record?

Mr. ZELLERS. Yes. We are not far enough advanced with the guidelines, Mr. MICHEL, to have anything to submit for the record at this time. We will have in a matter of days.

Mr. MICHEL. Taking a leaf out of the experience with respect to the rent subsidy program, and the fact that the rules and regulations were drawn up before the money was funded, we found out how lousy those regulations were and therefore denied the money. Is that the reason why you have not yet gotten them? You have had as much time as they had in housing.

Mr. ZELLERS. I am not familiar with their program. We have had no staff.

EMPLOYEES NOW WORKING ON PROGRAM AND ESTIMATE FOR FUTURE

Mr. MICHEL. Did I hear earlier in this hearing that there were about 60 people drawing up these plans so far? How many people have been detailed to this?

Mr. KARSH. You heard there were 60 identified in the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation last year and which Congress acted on favorably. We have hired nobody in those permanent positions. We have detailed people like Mr. Zellers.

Mr. MICHEL. How many people have you detailed to this particular program or any phase of this program?

Mr. KARSH. I believe we have had about a dozen or so people working on that.

Mr. ZELLERS. On a part-time basis.

Mr. MICHEL. In this first year of operation, how many administrators or people in administrative capacity are involved with this program other than actual teachers and trainees?

Mr. ZELLERS. You are referring to the Federal part of the operation?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. ZELLERS. Approximately 55 or 60.

Mr. MICHEL. When you say "Federal" will there be State people also involved?

Mr. ZELLERS. I was contrasting that with the local educational agency people.

Mr. MICHEL. Under this salary schedule, as I understand it, both the mother or father superior, whoever he may be, plus the trainees or interns, are at the salary level of whatever might exist in the district where they are asigned. Is that correct?

Mr. HOWE. Right.

PAYMENTS TO TEACHERS

Mr. MICHEL. What other emoluments will come to these teachers or trainees? Living expenses?

Mr. HOWE. Not living expenses. If they are displaced and have to move from State to State there is some compensation for that process. If the experienced teachers are moved out of the retirement system they are in, provision is made to carry over the provisions of their retirement system to the school they may be moved to.

Mr. MICHEL. These folks would not be considered to be Federal employees, would they?

Mr. HOWE. No. They are local employees.

Mr. MICHEL. They would not be subject to the Federal retirement program?

Mr. KARSH. No. They are covered by the Compensation Act only for injury or death; and only in this sense would they be considered Federal employees.

Mr. MICHEL. Would these teachers and trainees be permitted or obliged to join the teachers' union?

Mr. HOWE. That is a question I had not thought about. I would assume not. There is, as far as I know, no school system where the teachers are required to join the teachers' union, even though the teachers' union may be the bargaining agency for the school system. Therefore I would think these people would be free to exercise their choice in any way they wish.

LOCATION OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Mr. MICHEL. I think you said 80 percent of the disadvantaged students come from roughly 20 States. Do we have those States listed in the record? You mentioned a few of them.

Mr. HOWE. No, I do not believe they are listed in the record. I can furnish them for the record.

* * * * *

Mr. MICHEL. Where does my State of Illinois rank in this order of priority?

Mr. HOWE. You have 230,000 students in this category and in rank among the 20 States I would say you are roughly in the middle.

Mr. MICHEL. Does this suggest that the 30 States that apparently have only 20 percent of the disadvantaged students will be way down in priority when they apply for participation in the program?

Mr. HOWE. I would think this is the way the formula which we are required to use under the act would operate. Is that correct?

Mr. KARSH. That is correct. They would be eligible for teaching teams in the same way they are eligible under title I.

Mr. MICHEL. As I understand, many of the 20 States are in the South.

Mr. HOWE. Fourteen are Southern or border States.

Mr. MICHEL. In those Southern States is it not true salary schedules for teachers are below those in the industrial States?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

INDUCEMENTS FOR TEACHERS TO JOIN PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. What is the inducement for a teacher or a trainee to come in this program if they know they will be assigned to a State that has a salary scale lower than they could get if they put themselves on the market to teach in my State or any other State?

Mr. HOWE. This program will not work if it has to work purely on the basis of financial inducement. This program will have to work on the basis of service by people willing to make a sacrifice. In this sense it has some of the elements of the Peace Corps, VISTA, and so on. We have, particularly among young people these days, a willingness to make that kind of sacrifice, and I think the way this program is packaged and sold will certainly ask for people to be involved on that basis.

The same will be true of the experienced teachers connected with it. I think this is an important part of the whole program, trying to get citizens interested in working on a problem they have got.

Mr. KARSH. There is another very obvious inducement to a teacher intern. While he is at a local school we will be paying for his training toward a graduate degree, and this could induce many individuals to come into the program.

Mr. MICHEL. This is a point the chairman started to develop and I will pursue it because it suggests in part that the NDEA program is somewhat of a failure because we have not attracted enough people through the 50-percent loan forgiveness feature. Now we get into a Federal program to induce people to upgrade their own education, and you are talking not about the disadvantaged child but people who want to get a master's degree or a doctor's degree. How much emphasis is placed on this side as opposed to the child down the line?

Mr. KARSH. Considering where the teachers will be located during the 2 years, they will be right at the site where the need of these disadvantaged children is. They will be teaching for 2 years in an area that not only needs the new enthusiasm they may supply, but also where the teacher shortage is so great. We would be filling an existing shortage and getting an innovated type of teachers.

Mr. MICHEL. Are the shortages more prevalent in the rural areas or the urban areas?

Mr. HOWE. I am not sure about that.

Mr. MICHEL. What happens when this area of the disadvantaged is far remote from a university where they can get the so-called training in conjunction with their teaching?

Mr. HOWE. They will have to move back and forth somewhat. We have to devise patterns depending on the geography. For example we may pair some of these teachers and have them work half a year and go to the university half a year. The training in certain universities will make the disadvantaged children in a rural area available to them. People will have to move around some in this process.

Mr. MICHEL. You mention the motivation in the Peace Corps and VISTA and perhaps several others, that I think is very good, there has to be dedication to go to work for $75 a month or whatever it is, but here the inducement, in large measure, is an opportunity for those not altogether qualified for the teaching profession to upgrade their own education to become teachers or to get that extra degree, and then we get into definite competition for the educational requirements in all States of the country that you say are hurting for competent teachers. This is what disturbs me.

Mr. HOWE. I think the focus on working with the disadvantaged is the more important feature of this program.

Mr. MICHEL. That is what I thought.

Mr. HOWE. It is not reaching into other realms. It is definitely placing these teachers in training with a group of youngsers who have not had teachers from most schools of education. One of the things we need is to devise a process by which schools of education can prepare the teachers.

Mr. MICHEL. Will an intern have to have a minimum amount of experience?

Mr. HOWE. No. He must have a bacheior's degree, in accordance with the law.

Mr. CARDWELL. May I make a point there?

On your point about the individual intern or teacher gaining the advantage of a higher degree, which is in some sense a personal advantage, there is an accruing advantage to the community involved because the teacher who gets the degree will be gaining also specialized experience in teaching deprived children. So it is a twofold gain.

Mr. FLOOD. And under proper supervision.

Mr. CARDWELL. Yes, under proper supervision. An individual might gain an advantage, there is an inducement, but education also gains, the deprived child gains, and the community where the teacher teaches gains. It is more a matter of emphasis on the deprived child.

Mr. DUNCAN. Will you yield?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I TO PROPOSED ACTIVITIES OF TEACHER CORPS

Mr. DUNCAN. The more I think of this the less reason I see for having a special program of the Teacher Corps. I do not see why everything you mention cannot be donc under this title I, for which you are asking over $1 billion. I cannot see why we cannot just forget all about this Teacher Corps program and handle this whole thing under title I. You have your local control, financial assistance to local educational agencies with concentrations of children from low-income families, and it seems to me the disadvantaged children are covered by title I and I cannot understand why you cannot do everything you propose to do here under title I and maybe do it better.

Mr. HOWE. I suppose the answer to that is that it will not happen. This takes a coordinated program to bring into being a specific effort to train teachers for the disadvantaged. Title I is farmed out en bloc to the States and farmed out by them to each local community. You would have to ask a local community to move its program over to the kind of thing we are talking about here. You would have to interfere with its freedom of choice in terms of what it wants to do with those funds. You would have to have an accelerated program with the universities, setting up workshops. It might be possible to do this in urban areas but to serve the rural areas would be extremely difficult. Also, our request for next year is only sufficient to continue what is launched this year.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is your title I money serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. And is it not being used to improve the educational programs to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. And does it not include a program for handicapped children?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. And does it not include a program for the expansion of the school curriculum?

Mr. HOWE. Yes.

Mr. DUNCAN. And for decreasing class sizes so the teacher's time may be free of extracurricular activities?

Mr. HOWE. It includes all those elements.

Mr. DUNCAN. What will the Teacher Corps do that cannot be done under title I?

Mr. HOWE. Specifically, you do not find mentioned the actual teacher training program. You do have in the whole organization of title I at the present time a situation on which we have given States a basis for operation. It is a going concern. I would accept your point that it could be done under title I if we were to shift gears in title I and tell the States, "You have to stop doing what you did last year. We have a new program we want you to do."

Mr. DUNCAN. Which they can usc if they want it, because that is all you teil them under the Teacher Corps program.

Mr. HOWE. But in my judgment you would not achieve a careful focus on a teacher training program for the disadvantaged. A community that had a strong teacher training institution and title I funds, if it wanted, could elect to do this under title I. But I think you would find no comprehensive program for teacher training.

Mr. DUNCAN. I do not know much about education but it seems to me you have indicated that title I could be used to cover the Teacher Corps program because if you do not have confidence this could be done, I do not see how you can have confidence these other objectives would be carried out.

Mr. HOWE. We have launched these objectives and they are working. We could perhaps get title I funds operating this way, but I think it would be regarded by the States and communities as a shift in emphasis, as a new element; and I do not think we would get the kind of focus we want in teacher training. Perhaps under title I the various elements of this program could be funded. I would have to examine them one by one. It would depend, I suppose, on various legalisms under title I.

Mr. CARDWELL. There is a structural difference under title I and the Teachers Corps. Title I relies on the school district to propose projects under a State plan.

Mr. DUNCAN. Does not the Teachers Corps contemplate local initiative?

Mr. CARDWELL. There is a fundamental difference. In the case of a need for new and better trained teachers, the structure of title I authority does not give much opportunty for the local school district to develop this. Under the Teachers Corps the Government says, "Here are teachers at your option. You may choose these teachers and use them at the local level to solve your problem." Under title I they have that option.

Does this in a general way satisfy you?

Mr. DUNCAN. No; because you have a provision here for teachers' aids and I do not see that you have anything much different except you call them by a different name. It seems to me it gets around many of the objections that have been voiced here—Federal control, Federal payment of salaries, matching contributions.

I will not prolong this any longer, I am utilizing your time, Mr. Michel, and I apologize.

Mr. MICHEL. Not at all. I will have to subscribe to the points you make. All these things seem to be embodied in title I and it seems to me it would be better handled in that way rather than going far afield as we are doing.

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS

In this assignment of teachers, will these folks who become interns or teachers in the program have any voice in where they go?

Mr. HOWE. At least in the first year of this enterprise we are going to try to get the experienced teachers assigned on a basis of being near where they have been teaching rather than jumping them all around the country. But the interns who will be in training probably will be moved around quite a little and will serve in a variety of places.

WORKING THROUGH STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Mr. MICHEL. I certainly have to express my concern and dismay that your plans do not call for working through our State education offices.

Mr. FOGARTY. We will make it that way.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the chairman's observation there because it is quite obvious to me that if that shop did not like a particular superintendent of schools in Illinois or did not like the way a particular district was being run, they could discriminate against it by awarding this free teacher where there happened to be a superintendent they liked or a program they liked. This could be very well done in my State. I know why you would like to go directly to districts without going through a State office, but, as the chairman says, we may have something to say about this.

TEAM CONCEPT IN ASSIGNMENTS

How, specifically, will these districts qualify if they get a team? Do I understand you will not dispatch these people without anything less than a mother superior and intern?

Mr. HOWE. We hope to group most of them in teams. The team concept will prevail if we can set it up to do so. You need supervisory arrangements and you should not call on the people in the local school district to provide that. You might elect one of their people a member of the team and have his salary paid by the funds we provide, but you free him of his obligation in order to make this possible. So generally it is a team operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 3 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, there is not anything unusual in this appropriation request today. Detailed hearings were held last year on the Senate side on the authorization. It was included in the authorization bill by the Senate. The House-Senate conference accepted it and the House accepted it, on a record vote, by a substantial majority. When the Senate included it in the appropriation bill last year was not accepted by the House because we had no hearings before the Committee on Appropriations on the House side. We have now held hearings, and rather extensive hearings. So we have ample background on which to make intelligent decisions on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, the National Teachers Corps is a partnership between Government and the public and private education community. It is a partnership to enliven education at its weakest point, schools in the slums of our cities and the low-income areas of our countryside.

The Federal Government will recruit career teachers and teachers-interns, participate in their initial selection, and arrange to place them in preservice training programs in colleges and universities across the Nation.

At the same time, local education agencies will study their own school needs and submit proposals for the types and numbers of Teachers Corps men and women most needed in their poverty schools.

The colleges and universities—in cooperation with nearby local education agencies—will design and operate preservice training programs which combine course work and practice keyed specifically to teaching the disadvantaged. Teachers Corps men and women will be graduated on the basis of aptitude and motivation.

Teachers Corps members who complete their training will be carefully matched to local school district requests, and the local education agencies will themselves accept or reject candidates. Once Teachers Corps members enter the local school system, they will take their direction from the education agency of that area.

Local school districts will employ Teachers Corps members and pay their salaries at their own rates, and their costs will be covered by Federal funds. Colleges and universities, too, will be reimbursed by the Federal Government for training costs.

The National Teachers Corps is a federally financed effort to bring together qualified, committed men and women who want to use education to defeat poverty. Not only is it a new challenge for the gifted teacher who may well be able to serve near his home, but it is also a promising invitation to new and older college graduates—public service-minded college seniors, housewives, retired professionals, officeworkers, business people—to launch a new career in teaching in depressed areas all over America.

Our Nation needs all its human resources. To break the chain which today threatens to keep our 5 million schoolchildren of poverty from realizing their full potential, we must use every way possible to give these youngsters as much education as they can use. One bold new answer is the National Teachers Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I have voted for the amendment to strike out the $12 million item for rent supplementals. I shall vote for the amendment to strike out the item for the Teachers Corps. A motion to recommit is to be made in which we will have an opportunity to record our votes on the rent subsidy issue. With that in mind I should like to express my views about this proposal.

Let us bear in mind, once and for all, that far more is involved here than just the $12 million. It would be more accurate to say we are voting to begin a program which will ultimately cost $6 billion. It is just that simple.

It is true that last year the Congress, by a very narrow margin, approved authorization for a rental subsidy program. It cleared the House by six votes and was approved in the Senate by seven votes.

Under this law the expenditure of $30 million was authorized for the first year, and by 1968 the annual appropriation could be $150 million, for a period of 40 years. That adds up to $6 billion.

So, let us realize what the issue is: Do we want to inaugurate a $6 billion program? This is what we are asked to do.

Only last October this House, by a 185-to-162 rollcall, voted against initiating this $6 billion project. But we are told that pressures are being applied, and that the result will be different this time.

It would seem, however, that upon reflection the members would be reluctant to give the green light to a $6 billion expenditure at a time when the war in Vietnam is costing more than $10 billion a year. And particularly since no one seriously contends this new venture in Federal spending is essential in any sense of the word.

Mr. Chairman, this program is not only nonessential; it is also unsound. We have already spent billions to provide low-cost housing for the needy, and have witnessed that program expand to cover thousands who are not in the low-income brackets. Yet this scheme has been evolved ostensibly to help the needy.

Let us examine it for a moment. Copied from a similar British plan, adopted as a part of the British version of the welfare state, the proposal would have the Federal Government pay a portion of monthly rent bills for hundreds of thousands of so-called low-income tenants. The eligible tenant would be required to pay no more than 25 percent of his monthly income on rent; the balance

would be paid by the Federal Government.

It is said that to to be eligible the tenant could not be making more than $5,000 a year and could not have more than $2,000 in the bank. But that is determined by regulation of the Federal Housing Authority. The criteria can be changed. Last October when we were debating the same issue, the same law, it was pointed out that an eligible family could conceivably make up to $11,000 a year and be eligible. The law has not been changed since them. That being so, what assurance can we have that the $5,000 ceiling will not be raised by action of the housing authority—next week or next year?

Since there can certainly be no need for this program in order to provide housing for low-income people, just what is the reason for this new and expensive venture in welfare? What is the attitude of the administration concerning the motivation for this novel method of shifting low-income tenants into projects covered by this subsidy?

On September 28, 1965, the Federal Housing Administration issued instructions which revealed the primary purpose. In those instructions it stated:

Important criteria with regard to approval of a rent supplement project will include full consideration of its contribution to assisting in integrating income groups and furthering the legal requirements and objectives of equal opportunity in housing.

Thus it is made crystal clear that the primary purpose of paying rent supplementals is not to provide for housing needs for the eligibles, because they are already taken care of, but rather to promote social, economic and racial integration. In short, it is desired to channel more low-income tenants into middle-income neighborhoods—a sort of integration by scatteration. But is not $6 billion quite a price to pay for this new concept?

This is to be a boondoggle in more ways than one. The landlords will profit handsomely because, once approved, they will be guaranteed full occupancy for a period of 40 years, with the Federal Government supplying the tenants and paying the required portion of their monthly rentals. The limited income corporations, who are authorized to own and rent projects to these tenants, may make their 6 percent on the investment, and then add to that substantial tax benefits from depreciation.

The law enacted last year even authorizes churches to borrow money from the Government and erect apartment buildings for this purpose. While the operation is to be nonprofit, the costs of managers, auditors, attorneys, janitors, and scores of others will provide a constant source of profit for untold numbers who get on the payroll. It would seem that churches would have something more spiritual and divine to claim their attention. But the Congress has invited them to get into the housing business, to be underwritten by the Government.

More important than the bonanza for investors is the inherent danger in this new concept of direct monthly grants for certain selected tenants. Would this not tend to undermine the incentive of individuals to better themselves by their own efforts? It has been said, with good reason, that such subsidies will impose a penalty on honest achievement in a free-enterprise society, and a bonus for shiftlessness and other defects of individual character. It discourages homeownership and rewards those who are content with becoming wards of the State.

The motion to recommit, which if adopted would strike out funds for rent subsidies, should prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 128, noes 156.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. For what purposes does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, much of the remaining portion of this bill deals with pay increases provided for military and civilian personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, and be subject to points of order and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remainder of the bill?

If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 10, strike out lines 9 through 11 inclusive.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I was wondering if we could decide on some time limitation to end debate on this amendment and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 6 minutes with the last minute to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would have to object to a reservation of time to the committee at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have moved to this side to address my colleagues because at this time I am representing the President of the United States. I am delighted to be able to do it. There is in this bill an unnecessary and unbudgeted item of $41 million for the funding of Public Laws 815 and 874.

There have been three administrations that for nearly 10 years have been trying to reduce this impacted school area fund. The President left it out of the budget entirely and the President has asked the Congress not to fund this.

I know how popular this program is with so many people and I know how difficult it would be for you if you went on the record voting against it. But let us kind of do what the President wants.

I do not know whether Larry O'Brien, when he was talking about the rent subsidy program, discussed this with you or not. That was an increase in the budget that he was talking about. But I rather hoped that he presented also the President's views on this particular subsidy.

Let me give you an idea, if I may, and then I will yield. I would like to make one or two points. Take the last 15 years of this impacted school area fund and its use in the very prosperous suburbs of the city of Washington. They received $75,829,071 for the construction of schools under Public Law 815.

In the last school year the same jurisdictions were eligible for $17 million.

Let us examine what the impact really is. Let us consider Montgomery County. The richest county in the United States, according to the people who live out there. That is the boast of their citizens. The average per capita income in Arlington, Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax County is well above the national average, because a great many Federal Government employees make their homes there.

Prince William County in Virginia and Prince Georges County in Maryland are among the fastest growing counties in the country, all because of Federal employees being there.

What kind of impact have we created in those areas? Let me say this to you, my friends: Just because a pilot of the United Airlines plane lands out at the Washington National Airport and lives in Virginia, his children get this impact area money. If somebody is born and raised out in one of the adjoining counties, never intends to leave, never expects to, but works for the Federal Government, although he is paying taxes and taking care of his obligations the same as the next door neighbor, he gets the impact school money.

What has happened out here? Take Montgomery County. In 1953 the assessed valuation of the property there was $879,974,000. That has gone up to $1 billion. It is over $1 billion now. Because of this impact, these areas are growing. They are prospering. Supermarkets are being built. Go out Route 70S, for instance. Take a look at what

has happened along Route 70S. We have constructed facilities for the Bureau of Standards and the Atomic Energy Commission. You say that is an impacted area. But if you look around, you will find the entire countryside with new homes built there, new communities, completely new cities being built there because of the Federal impact.

I would like to ask some of these people who are objecting to that Federal impact to let me have some of those industries back in my part of the country, and I promise you that we will not ask for this impact money, if we can build these areas the way they have been built around here. I raise this question knowing what is going to happen to this amendment. I am for impact area funds, but I think the legislative committees ought to amend these laws so we have a true impact school area where you have the impact from the moving of military groups or the Indian situation that we have. But it is perfectly ridiculous to observe that in the last few years $75 million has gone into areas adjoining Washington to build this metropolis of large cities from sleepy little villages.

It has been done because the Federal Government is here and because of the so-called impact. There is no impact that should demand this kind of money being paid into those areas. There are proper impacts, but it seems to me that we ought to begin to take a look at it, and this will be a good time to help the President save $41 million. He is disturbed about it, as we see in the press.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, and I shall take only a moment. I do want to say that I think there is much merit in some of the statements which have been made by the gentleman from Ohio in support of his amendment to delete the $41 million. But the bill before us is a bill which was worked out over a period of weeks on a give and take basis and I see no alternative at this stage other than to support it.

Many compromises were made in order to achieve agreement. This is the only feasible way to handle differences in legislative matters.

I myself feel that it is time to change the system with respect to aid to impacted areas, and I agree with the President, and I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that something should be done to improve the situation. Some aid to impacted areas is required but the present system should be drastically changed.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not authorized to speak for the President, but I believe he would like me to welcome the gentleman from Ohio to his side.

I am sure the gentleman realizes that he is foredoomed to failure, because despite the great economizers that we have here, there are 315 Members who have impacted areas.

The gentleman does not have them in his district, and I do not have any impacted areas in my district, so I am going to join the gentleman in his great statesmanship and support his motion to strike this appropriation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the President has been helping us all day with his news conference and with other information that he has put forward with respect to inflation and the rising cost of living on this particular day, and we want to help him now.

Mr. JOELSON. I am glad you are helping him, because after all you are trying to strike out $12 million from the budget and adding on $41 million. That is real economy.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out the difficulty we have in amending educational legislation, once it gets on the books. Last year we passed the Elementary and Secondary School Act. We just agreed to the Teachers Corps money, which will go in this bill when it is enacted. There are many features of it that will be unwise in the future. It will be very difficult to amend the bill.

Efforts have been made by previous administrations, as well as this administration, to amend Federal impact aid to reduce the aid to certain areas where it should not go. Mention was made of Montgomery County, Md., which is a prime example. Never can we get this done. Never is the Congress really willing to amend impact legislation other than to expand it, for fear that the money will be delayed and pass the budgeting date for the local districts.

This is to me an indication of why it is unwise for the Federal Government to expend aid to elementary and secondary education without thoroughly studying the measure before we pass it. This is why it is so unwise for us to fund the National Teachers Corps, poorly drafted, no study, no contribution in its development by educators.

Now that the National Teachers Corps will be funded, we will see that school districts which will receive this 90 percent federally financed Teachers Corps will be asking their Congressmen to be sure to keep that money coming so that they can continue to have those teachers come to their districts, just as they ask their Congressmen to continue sending the impact aid money whether justified or not.

This is a vicious circle we have gotten into. In my congressional district we do receive some Federal impact aid, but I think it is so unwise to continue it as we have in the past, that I am going to vote with the gentleman from Ohio, because we have much better education use for this money than we do here in the Federal impact aid.

I would like to see the Bow amendment prevail, so that we can at least give an indication that we will not continue to provide money where it should not be expended and the people know that mistakes in education legislation in the future can be corrected.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment to strike funds for Public Laws 815 and 874.

The impact of this amendment, if adopted, would be disastrous in many school districts of the country. I am sure it will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased by the action of the House in defeating the amendment to kill the Teacher Corps and appreciate the committee's action in providing the funds for title I financing under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

As we improve the breadth and the quality of educational opportunity in this Nation we strengthen the entire fabric of our democracy.

I feel sure this bill will be approved by an overwhelming majority, thereby continuing the role of this 89th Congress as "the education Congress."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation for schools in federally impacted areas was acted on by Congress last year we had been assured by the Office of Education that the amount would cover 100 percent of entitlements according to their best estimate. This was clearly set forth in the hearings and reports. The schools made up their budgets depending on this. They had every right to do so.

Then in the closing days of last session this Congress amended the authorizing legislation and liberalized it. Largely because of this the appropriation is now $41 million short of being sufficient to cover 100 percent of legal entitlements.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress has a strong moral commitment to meet fully what the law entitles these schools to receive. In many instances, if we do not, it would actually deprive children of education they would otherwise receive, for it is too late for the schools to make up the deficit in their budgets from other sources. I, therefore, strongly urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bow amendment and in support of H.R. 14012, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1966.

It is abundantly clear from the committee's report that the bulk of the recommended appropriations is largely nondiscretionary in nature; that is, most of the requested funds represent mandatory-type expenditures to cover such obligations as matching grants under the public assistance program, veterans' compensation and pensions, and the Federal pay rate increases.

Some of the recommended appropriations, however, are obviously discretionary in character, and I am of the opinion that the Commitee on Appropriations deserves our generous applause for including them in the bill. Among these I would cite the recommended supplement for financing title I of Public Law

89–10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the initial funding for the National Teacher Corps; and the suggested $11 million for the college library assistance program under title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965. But as an even more praiseworthy suggestion than the foregoing, I would single out the recommended supplemental appropriation in the amount of $41 million for payments to school districts under Public Law 874, the operation and maintenance segment of the federally affected areas program.

Ever since the budget for fiscal year 1967 was made public, the program under Public Laws 815 and 874 has been a good deal in the news, and, I am sure, a good deal in the thoughts of many Members of this body. That budget, you will no doubt recall, asks for a drastic cutback in the level of financing under both of the acts—a cutback that would amount to about $233 million under Public Law 874 alone. Now, although I am opposed to a decrease on that order, I realize this is not the time to discuss it. I bring it us simply because one of its byproducts is most germane to the issue we have presently under our consideration.

Stated simply, it is this: in the furor—and I do not think the word will prove to be too strong—which has arisen over the requested 1967 financing of the federally impacted areas program, it has been rather easy to forget about the actual 1966 financing of the program. The able gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and his colleagues on the Appropriation Committee did not forget, however, and again I congratulate them on their clearsightedness.

The unfortunate situation which their recommendation would remedy is actually quite simple. For fiscal year 1966, the Office of Education estimated that funding in the amount of $347 million would be necessary to pay all school districts the full amount of their entitlements under Public Law 874. The Office has been making such estimates for 15 years now, and they usually run pretty close. Consequently, we appropriated the estimated amount, $347 million, to finance the program for fiscal 1966.

If the provisions of Public Law 874 were the same now as they were when the Office of Education made its estimate for fiscal 1966, the $347 million would, in all probability, be sufficient to cover all entitlements in the current fiscal year. That is not the case, however. The 1st session of the 89th Congress enacted several amendments to the already much-amended basic legislation. Most of these amendments moved toward liberalizing payments under Public Law 874. Most notable of the changes was the so-called big city amendment in Public Law 89–313, under which 18 of our largest school districts, including the Dade County school system of Miami, become eligible for the first time for payments under the program.

Largely as a result of these amendments, the $347 million we have already appropriated for the program this year will not be enough to pay full entitlements. The big city amendment itself will call for an estimated $19 million. A total of $41 million in additional appropriations is required if entitlements under the amended act are to be paid in full. This is the amount the committee has recommended; that is the amount I sincerely hope we will be able to agree upon.

If the supplemental sum is not forthcoming, the program will literally be decimated. The amount of payment to each eligible district would have to be ratably reduced with the result that each obligation entered upon by a district in the expectation of 100 Federal dollars would have to be met by them, somehow, with an actual payment of about 90 of those dollars. I believe this Congress undertook to reimburse the local school districts, already hard pressed, for the Federal burden placed upon them, not for nine-tenths of that burden. For that reason, I commend the Committee on Appropriations once again for their action, and I urge the passage of this legislation with the funds for Public Law 874 intact.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask at this time for a vote, and that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise the membership that there will be a motion to recommit. The motion to recommit will include the rent supplement program, upon which I will request a call of the roll.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. CORMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

May I inquire, sir, if the provision under chapter IX, page 18, from lines 3 through 9, the sum of $10,250,000 includes a claim of Melville L. Owings?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. This claim will be paid through this appropriation. Other claims will be covered where adjudication has been taken to a court.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would call attention of the Chair to page 13 of House Document No. 414, telling us about Mr. Owings' claim, that there are two instances involved in this claim. The larger is for $9,544, for the death of 5,935 turkeys, when low-flying National Guard aircraft stampeded turkeys and they were destroyed.

I had assumed a turkey of this size would be called to our attention by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Chairman, that turkey is not as big as the one dragged out for our consideration by the gentleman from New York, who earlier today urged us to defeat the rent supplement program and expand the public housing program, as he put it, European style.

Shortly after we were burdended with this advice, another gentleman from that side of the aisle, the gentleman from Georgia, gave us a graphic description of drab, colorless public housing which he observed in Russia.

If we are to find a consensus of advice from our friends on the Republican side, I assume it is that we pattern socialism, European style west of the Ural Mountains.

Now it is patently clear that the concept of a rent supplement program is to give the private sector of our economy the tools with which to solve a serious social and economic problem—the problem of inadequate housing for those among us of very limited means.

The truly troublesome part of the case of the gentleman from New York was his constant warning that "integrated" housing would be inflicted on the suburbs under the rent supplement proposal. Now, the gentleman did use the words "economic integration," but there can be little doubt as to the thrust of his argument. He fears that undesirables from the slums of our big cities will be thrust into the suburbs to live with the nice people. This sounds to me much like an echo from the cave of the winds which was the 1964 Republican convention in San Francisco.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14012) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 4, line 6, strike out lines 6 through 22, inclusive.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 198, answered "present" 3, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—190

Abbitt	Fisher	Morton.
Abernethy	Flynt	Mosher
Adair	Foley	Natcher
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Nelsen
Andrews, George W.	Fountain	Olson, Minn.
	Frelinghuysen	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, Glenn	Fulton, Pa.	Passman
	Gathings	Pelly
Andrews, N. Dak.	Goodell	Pirnie
	Greigg	Poage
Arends	Griffin	Poff
Ashbrook	Gross	Pool
Ayres	Grover	Purcell
Baring	Gubser	Quie
Bates	Gurney	Quillen
Belcher	Hagan, Ga.	Randall
Bell	Haley	Reid, Ill.
Bennett	Hall	Reifel
Berry	Halleck	Reinecke
Betts	Hamilton	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Hansen, Idaho	Roberts
Bow	Hardy	Robison
Bray	Harsha	Rogers, Fla.
Brock	Harvey, Ind.	Rogers, Tex.
Broomfield	Hébert	Roudebush
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Rumsfeld
Broyhill, N.C.	Herlong	Satterfield
Broyhill, Va.	Hicks	Saylor
Buchanan	Hosmer	Schneebeli
Burton, Utah	Hull	Schweiker
Byrnes, Wis.	Hutchinson	Selden
Cabell	Ichord	Shriver
Cahill	Jarman	Sikes
Callaway	Jennings	Skubitz
Cederberg	Johnson, Pa.	Smith Calif.
Chamberlain	Jonas	Smith, Va.
Clancy	Jones, Ala.	Springer
Clausen, Don H	Jones, Mo.	Stafford
	Keith	Stanton
Clawson, Del	King, N.Y.	Stratton
Cleveland	King, Utah	Stubblefield
Collier	Kornegay	Sweeney
Conable	Kunkel	Talcott
Cooley	Laird	Taylor
Corbett	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Cramer	Latta	Teague, Tex.
Culver	Lennon	Thomson, Wis.
Cunningham	Lipscomb	Tuck
Curtin	Long, La.	Utt
Curtis	McCarthy	Waggonner
Dague	McClory	Walker, Miss.
Davis, Ga	McCulloch	Watkins
Davis, Wis.	McDade	Watson
Derwinski	McEwen	Watts
Devine	Marsh	White, Idaho
Dickinson	Martin, Ala.	White, Tex.
Dole	Martin, Nebr.	Whitener
Downing	Mathias	Whitten
Duncan, Tenn.	May	Widnall
Dwyer	Michel	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Minshall	Wilson, Bob
Ellsworth	Mize	Wyatt
Erlenborn	Moeller	Wydler
Findley	Moore	Younger
Fino	Morse	

NAYS—198

Adams	Brademas	Daniels
Addabbo	Brooks	Dawson
Albert	Brown, Calif.	de la Garza
Anderson, Tenn.	Burke	Delaney
	Burton, Calif.	Dent
Annunzio	Byrne, Pa.	Denton
Ashley	Callan	Diggs
Aspinall	Carey	Dingell
Bandstra	Casey	Donohue
Barrett	Celler	Dow
Beckworth	Clevenger	Dulski
Bingham	Cohelan	Duncan Oreg
Blatnik	Conyers	Dyal
Boggs	Corman	Edmondson
Boland	Craley	Edwards, Calif.
Bolling	Daddario	Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.	Kelly	Rees
Everett	King, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Evins, Tenn.	Kirwan	Resnick
Farbstein	Kluczynski	Reuss
Farnsley	Krebs	Rhodes, Pa.
Farnum	Kupferman	Rivers, Alaska
Fascell	Landrum	Rodino
Feighan	Long, Md	Rogers, Colo.
Flood	Love	Ronan
Fogarty	McDowell	Roncalio
Ford, William D.	McFall	Rooney, Pa.
	McGrath	Rosenthal
Fraser	McVicker	Rostenkowski
Friedel	Macdonald	Roush
Gallagher	Machen	Roybal
Giaimo	Mackay	Ryan
Gibbons	Mackie	St Germain
Gilbert	Madden	St. Onge
Gilligan	Mahon	Scheuer
Gonzalez	Matsunaga	Schisler
Grabowski	Meeds	Schmidhauser
Gray	Miller	Secrest
Green, Oreg.	Minish	Shipley
Green, Pa.	Mink	Sickles
Grider	Monagan	Sisk
Griffiths	Moorhead	Slack
Hagen, Calif.	Morgan	Staggers
Halpern	Morris	Stalbaum
Hanley	Morrison	Steed
Hansen, Iowa	Moss	Stephens
Hansen, Wash	Multer	Sullivan
Harvey, Mich.	Murphy Ill	Tenzer
Hathaway	Murphy, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Hawkins	Nedzi	Thompson, Tex.
Hechler	Nix	Trimble
Helstoski	O'Hara, Ill.	Tupper
Holifield	O'Hara, Mich.	Tuten
Holland	Olsen, Mont.	Udall
Horton	O'Neill, Mass.	Ullman
Howard	Ottinger	Van Deerlin
Hungate	Patman	Vanik
Huot	Patten	Vigorito
Irwin	Pepper	Vivian
Jacobs	Perkins	Walker, N. Mex.
Joelson	Philbin	Weltner
Johnson, Calif	Pickle	Wilson, Charles H
Johnson, Okla.	Powell	
Karsten	Price	Wolff
Karth	Pucinski	Yates
Kastenmeier	Race	Young
Kee	Redlin	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Conte	Pike	Tunney

NOT VOTING—40

Ashmore	Gettys	O'Konski
Battin	Hanna	Rivers, S.C.
Burleson	Hays	Rooney, N.Y.
Cameron	Jones, N.C.	Scott
Carter	Keogh	Senner
Chelf	Leggett	Smith, Iowa
Clark	McMillan	Smith, N.Y.
Colmer	MacGregor	Todd
Dorn	Mailliard	Toll
Dowdy	Martin, Mass.	Whalley
Fallon	Matthews	Willis
Fulton, Tenn.	Mills	Wright
Fuqua	Murray	
Garmatz	O'Brien	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pike for, with Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Hays against.
Mr. Tunney for, with Mr. Cameron against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Toll against.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Clark against.
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Hanna against.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Leggett against.
Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.
Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Fallon against.
Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Todd with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Willis with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMERON]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I have voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 122, answered "present" 2, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—269

Adams	Dwyer	Ichord
Addabbo	Dyal	Irwin
Albert	Edmondson	Jacobs
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, Calif.	Jarman
	Edwards, La.	Jennings
Andrews, N. Dak.	Ellsworth	Joelson
	Evans, Colo.	Johnson, Calif.
Annunzio	Everett	Johnson, Okla.
Ashley	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.
Aspinall	Farbstein	Karsten
Ayres	Farnsley	Karth
Bandstra	Farnum	Kastenmeier
Barrett	Fascell	Kee
Bates	Feighan	Keith
Beckworth	Fino	Kelly
Bell	Fisher	King, Calif.
Berry	Flood	King, N.Y.
Bingham	Fogarty	King, Utah
Blatnik	Foley	Kirwan
Boggs	Ford, William D.	Kluczynski
Boland		Krebs
Bolling	Fraser	Kupferman
Brademas	Friedel	Landrum
Brooks	Fulton, Tenn.	Long, Md.
Broomfield	Gallagher	Love
Brown, Calif.	Garmatz	McDade
Broyhill, Va.	Giaimo	McDowell
Burke	Gibbons	McFall
Burton, Calif.	Gilbert	McGrath
Byrne, Pa.	Gilligan	McVicker
Cahill	Gonzalez	Macdonald
Callan	Grabowski	Machen
Carey	Gray	Mackay
Casey	Green, Oreg.	Mackie
Celler	Green, Pa.	Madden
Clausen, Don H	Greigg	Mahon
	Grider	Mathias
Cleveland	Griffin	Matsunaga
Clevenger	Griffiths	May
Cohelan	Gubser	Meeds
Conte	Hagen, Calif.	Miller
Conyers	Halpern	Minish
Corman	Hamilton	Mink
Craley	Hanley	Mize
Culver	Hansen, Iowa	Moeller
Cunningham	Hansen, Wash.	Monagan
Daddario	Hardy	Moore
Daniels	Harvey, Mich.	Moorhead
Davis, Ga.	Hathaway	Morgan
Dawson	Hawkins	Morris
de la Garza	Hébert	Morrison
Delaney	Hechler	Morse
Dent	Helstoski	Moss
Denton	Hicks	Multer
Diggs	Holifield	Murphy, Ill.
Dingell	Holland	Murphy, N.Y.
Donohue	Horton	Natcher
Dow	Hosmer	Nedzi
Downing	Howard	Nix
Dulski	Hungate	O'Hara, Ill.
Duncan, Oreg.	Huot	O'Hara, Mich.

Olsen, Mont.	Ronan	Teague, Calif.
Olson, Minn.	Roncalio	Tenzer
O'Neill, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.	Thompson, N.J.
Ottinger	Rosenthal	Thompson, Tex.
Patman	Rostenkowski	Trimble
Patten	Roush	Tunney
Pepper	Roybal	Tupper
Perkins	Ryan	Tuten
Philbin	St Germain	Udall
Pickle	St. Onge	Ullman
Pirnie	Scheuer	Van Deerlin
Poage	Schisler	Vanik
Powell	Schmidhauser	Vigorito
Price	Schweiker	Vivian
Pucinski	Secrest	Walker, N. Mex.
Purcell	Shipley	Watts
Race	Shriver	Weltner
Randall	Sickles	White, Idaho
Redlin	Sisk	White, Tex.
Rees	Skubitz	Widnall
Reid, N.Y.	Slack	Wilson,
Reifel	Stafford	Charles H.
Reinecke	Staggers	Wolff
Resnick	Stalbaum	Wyatt
Reuss	Steed	Wydler
Rhodes, Pa.	Stephens	Yates
Rivers, Alaska	Stratton	Young
Roberts	Stubblefield	Younger
Rodino	Sullivan	Zablocki
Rogers, Colo.	Sweeney	
Rogers, Tex.	Talcott	

NAYS—122

Abbitt	Edwards, Ala.	Michel
Abernethy	Erlenborn	Minshall
Adair	Findley	Morton
Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Mosher
Andrews, George W.	Ford, Gerald R.	Nelsen
	Fountain	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, Glenn	Frelinghuysen	Passman
	Fulton, Pa.	Pelly
Arends	Gathings	Pike
Ashbrook	Goodell	Poff
Baring	Gross	Pool
Belcher	Grover	Quie
Bennett	Gurney	Quillen
Betts	Hagan, Ga.	Reid, Ill.
Bolton	Haley	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bow	Hall	Robison
Bray	Halleck	Rogers, Fla.
Brock	Hansen, Idaho	Roudebush
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Rumsfeld
Broyhill, N.C.	Harvey, Ind.	Satterfield
Buchanan	Henderson	Saylor
Burton, Utah	Herlong	Schneebeli
Byrnes, Wis.	Hull	Selden
Cahell	Hutchinson	Sikes
Callaway	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Calif.
Chamberlain	Jonas	Smith, Va.
Clancy	Jones, Mo.	Springer
Clawson, Del	Kornegay	Stanton
Collier	Kunkel	Taylor
Conable	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Langen	Thomson, Wis.
Corbett	Latta	Tuck
Cramer	Lennon	Waggonner
Curtin	Lipscomb	Walker, Miss.
Curtis	Long, La.	Watkins
Dague	McCarthy	Watson
Davis, Wis.	McClory	Whitener
Derwinski	McCulloch	Whitten
Devine	McEwen	Williams
Dickinson	Marsh	Wilson, Bob
Dole	Martin, Ala.	
Duncan, Tenn.	Martin, Nebr.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Cederberg	Utt

NOT VOTING—38

Ashmore	Hanna	O'Konski
Battin	Hays	Rivers, S.C.
Burleson	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cameron	Keogh	Scott
Carter	Leggett	Senner
Chelf	McMillan	Smith, Iowa
Clark	MacGregor	Smith, N.Y.
Colmer	Mailliard	Todd
Dorn	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Dowdy	Matthews	Whalley
Fallon	Mills	Willis
Fuqua	Murray	Wright
Gettys	O'Brien	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Cameron for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Ashmore against.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Batten against.

Mr. Todd for, with Mr. Mailliard against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Hay for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Chelf with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Willis.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN AMERICAN FOUNDATION

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last night, at a state dinner in honor of Prime Minister Gandhi, President Johnson added a practical proposal to his tribute to the great leader of India. He said:

Tonight we mark the visit of Prime Minister Gandhi with a lasting endowment for the benefit of inquiring young minds in the Indian nation. May we launch a new and imaginative venture—an Indian American Foundation. Such a Foundation—

The President said—

would be given a broad charter to promote progress in all fields of learning, advance science, encourage research, and develop new teaching techniques in farm and factory to stimulate new ways to meet age-old problems.

I have discussed this idea with the Secretary of Agriculture, with officials on the President's staff, and with responsible persons in the State Department. I am convinced that this Indian American Foundation is a worthwhile and promising proposal.

The serious problem facing the Indian people, as with those facing every nation, will be solved ultimately by the application of native knowledge and determination, not only by financial resources.

This foundation, dedicated to educational, scientific and agricultural progress, will be a way of achieving such solutions. I heartily endorse the President's idea. I trust that those in the Congress whose support is needed to expedite this program will readily give their support to the establishment of the Indian American Foundation. It is at once an organization of practical significance and a symbol of cordial relations between our two nations.

INDIAN-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the majority leader for the very fine statement that he has just made with respect to the action taken by our Government on the occasion of the visit of the gracious Prime Minister and First Lady of India, Mrs. Gandhi.

I had the pleasure of being in India not too long ago. Many people pointed out to me how wise it would be to utilize the accumulation of funds there which had been brought about through Public Law 480 and other programs such as the food-for-peace program in operation in that great nation. This is indeed a very sensible step by our Government.

The Indian-American Foundation will become an important new resource in helping India attack the persistent and vexing problems of illiteracy, poverty, hunger, and malnutrition.

It is an imaginative and sensible plan.

The Foundation has the potential for doing a vast amount of good for the Indian people, at minimum cost to the United States.

Under the food-for-peace program, we have sold large quantities of our surplus food to India for Indian rupees. In so doing, the United States has become the owner of nearly $300 million in Indian rupees, most of which cannot legally be converted into dollars or other "hard" currency. This accumulation of Indian currency is far more than is needed to carry out U.S. Government purposes and programs in India.

By putting these funds to constructive use, we not only find work for idle funds to do, but can bring a fresh approach to India's problems in education, science, and agriculture at virtually no cost in U.S. dollars.

It is recognized by all that educational and scientific development is vital to the growth of sound economies in which every natural resource is harnessed for the betterment of the people. It is the aim of the Indian-American Foundation to hasten this process.

The Foundation will serve as a continuing source of finance for new initiatives in education and science and for the further support of promising projects already underway. It will support individual and institutional efforts to supplement existing programs, both public and private. It will encourage pioneering, innovation, and diversity beyond the normal range of publicly supported projects. It will, in short, do things which the Indian Government cannot undertake to do.

The program, while details have yet to be worked out, will be aimed at unlocking the latent skills and dormant resources of this keystone of democracy in Asia. The program will develop centers for research, provide scholarships for higher education and advanced study, help establish teacher training schools, provide special skill training for the "educated unemployed" and provide enlarged opportunities for American and other area studies and research in India and

for Indian studies and research by American students and scholars.

The program content will reflect the results of a continuing, objective, and systematic study of Indian educational and scientific needs.

The Foundation can contribute much toward furthering India's plans for lasting social and economic growth and can have far-reaching impact in improving the lot of her 490 million people.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege last night to be among the guests at the White House dinner for Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India.

On that occasion President Johnson, in a toast, proposed the establishment of an Indian-American Foundation to be financed by $300 million worth of Indian currencies held by the United States through the sale of surplus agricultural products.

The President is to be commended for this imaginative, productive, and far-sighted use of these funds to aid in the progress of learning in India.

The Indian American Foundation will put to practical use funds which now are lying idle, of no benefit to the United States or to the people of India.

Unfortunately, there is no chance of converting these currencies into dollars at present or in the foreseeable future without doing grave harm to the Indian economy.

To leave the funds unused, however, is contrary to the interests of all concerned who seek that all available resources be put to work in the interests of economic progress.

I am particularly pleased that the chief objectives of the Foundation will be the development of agriculture and education in India.

Last fall a study mission of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific visited India. The report of the study mission, of which I was chairman, emphasized the importance of increased emphasis on both agriculture and education if India is to become economically self-sustaining.

The Foundation has many advantages. It will not require repeated or continuous appropriation of funds. It will operate on the interest of its endowment and will attract donations from private sources. It will have no inflationary effects on the Indian economy.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Foundation is yet another American contribution to international cooperation and institution-building, based as it is on the uniquely American concept of the large, independent foundation supporting innovation and experimentation without Government support or control.

The idea of the binational foundation may have similarly beneficial applications elsewhere. For example, perhaps the Philippine War Damage Special Fund might be used to endow a permanent educational foundation, the income of which could be used to assist public and private education in the Philippine Islands.

A similar suggestion was contained in the final report of the Philippine-American Assembly which met last month in Davao, Republic of the Philippines, and which was attended by distinguished citizens of both countries.

As President Johnson said in his toast last evening:

> The journey to the future is over a long, winding road, every mile tested by challenge and doubt.

By proposing the Indian-American Foundation, the President has lighted a lamp along that road to the future.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1966

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on Education and Labor on the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966, will today be filed in this body. This legislation is vital to many of our programs and, in particular, to the declared war on poverty. The bill has enjoyed incredible success to date. I believe this to be true because it is an equitable measure for all concerned. It extends the coverage of minimum wage protection to over 7.2 million workers. It further raises the minimum wage, in gradual increments, to $1.60 an hour.

I am submitting the summary of provisions of our bill so that Members may analyze its content. I am hopeful that this legislation will soon meet the favorable consideration it deserves.

Any Member of Congress who finds that some of the provisions of the act are not quite clear and he has any questions about them, I shall be happy to sit down with him and try to clear it up for him.

The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AMENDMENTS AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, MARCH 21, 1966

I. PURPOSE

A. To extend minimum wage and overtime protection to certain employees.

Minimum wage protection will be extended to employees in the following:

Retailing, including auto, truck, and farm implement dealerships;
Construction;
Laundering and drycleaning;
Transit and taxicab systems;
Restaurants and food service establishments;
Logging;
Agriculture and agricultural employees;
Hotels and motels;
Hospitals and related institutions; and
Federal Government.

Overtime protection will be extended to employees in the following:

Retailing, including auto, truck, and farm implement dealerships (excluding salesmen and mechanics);
Construction;
Laundering and drycleaning;
Transit and taxicab systems (excluding operating employees);
Logging;
Agricultural processing;
Hospitals and related institutions;
Gasoline service stations; and
Federal Government.

B. To raise the minimum wage

Employees	Hourly rate	Effective date
Presently covered (29,600,000)	$1.40	Feb. 1, 1967
	1.60	Feb. 1, 1968
Newly covered (nonfarm) (6,093,000).	1.00	Feb. 1, 1967
	1.15	Feb. 1, 1968
	1.30	Feb. 1, 1969
	1.45	Feb. 1, 1970
	1.60	Feb. 1, 1971
Agriculture (485,000)	1.00	Feb. 1, 1967
	1.15	Feb. 1, 1968
	1.30	Feb. 1, 1969
Federal employees (665,000)	1.40	Feb. 1, 1967
	1.60	Feb. 1, 1968

C. To provide overtime protection for newly covered employees:

A newly covered employee must receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times the regular rate at which he is employed for hours of employment in excess of—

	Effective date
44 hours in any workweek	Feb. 1, 1967.
42 hours in any workweek	Feb. 1, 1968.
40 hours in any workweek	Feb. 1, 1969.

II. EXTENSION OF MINIMUM WAGE

Estimated distribution of nonsupervisory employees who would be brought under minimum wage protection of the act in 1967 and 1969 by the bill:

[In thousands]

Industry	Employees added to minimum wage coverage			Total employees subject to minimum wage provisions
	1967	1969	Total	
Retail trade	1,155	345	1,500	4,086
Restaurants	300	125	425	432
Hotels and motels	240	35	275	275
Hospitals and related institutions	1,471		1,471	1,471
Miscellaneous services	20	30	50	349
Laundries	505		505	523
Agriculture	485		485	485
Transit systems	60	5	65	65
Agriculture in area of production	90		90	90
Taxicabs	75	25	100	100
Logging	37		37	37
Cotton ginning	34		34	34
Construction	581		581	2,994
Federal Government	665		665	665
All other industries	570	390	960	25,230
Total	6,288	955	7,243	36,836

NOTE.—These estimates do not reflect coverage of employees of employers providing contract services for the United States.

H. R. 14012

AN ACT

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14012

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 1, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second

Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Federal Payment to District of Columbia

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" for the general fund, $1,250,000.

Operating Expenses

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including $3,700 for disbursement by the administrative office of the United States courts for expenses of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, $1,249,200, of which $111,600 shall be payable from the highway fund, $200 from the water fund, and $200 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", $210,600.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be

paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year involved.

CHAPTER II

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Selective Service System

salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $10,180,000.

Veterans Administration

compensation and pensions

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", $288,000,000, to remain available until expended.

readjustment benefits

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", including not to exceed $75,000 for the purposes of section 5 of

the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–41), $45,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

rent supplement program

For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $100,000: *Provided,* That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451 (c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $1,495,000.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", $755,000.

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", $1,028,000.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", $827,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $900,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)", $5,500,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $148,000.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $658,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For additional amounts for "Forest protection and utilization", as follows:

"Forest land management", $9,635,000;

"Forest research", $610,000; and

"State and private forestry cooperation", $45,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $18,000.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For an additional amount for "Transitional grants to Alaska", $876,000.

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses of worker adjustment assistance allowances and for administration of adjustment assistance services to workers as provided in Title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794), and Title III of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–283), $1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses," $1,028,000, of which

$821,900 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" and $206,100 may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

Wage and Labor Standards

wage and hour division, salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", $614,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

expansion and improvement of vocational education

For an additional amount for "Expansion and improvement of vocational education", for advances for reserve funds and interest payments on insured loans under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, $950,000.

VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

For the vocational student loan insurance fund created by section 13 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (70 Stat. 1046), $50,000, to remain available until expended.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Elementary and secondary educational activities", for meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children under title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, $184,000,000.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher Educational Activities", $11,300,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for basic grants authorized in section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $1,000,000 shall be for training grants under section 223 of that Act, and $300,000 shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials under part C of title II of that Act.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

For the National Teacher Corps authorized in part B

of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $10,000,000: *Provided,* That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: *Provided further,* That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts", $41,000,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES

For an additional amount for "Grants to States", for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, $39,000,000.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount for "National Library of Medicine", including carrying out the Medical Library Assistance

Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1059), $4,175,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1967.

Social Security Administration

payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance trust funds, as authorized by sections 103 and 111 (d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and section 1844 of the Social Security Act, $125,800,000, of which $100,000,000 shall remain available through December 31, 1967, as authorized by section 1844.

payment for military service credits

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the Federal Disability Insurance, and the Federal Hospital Insurance trust funds, for benefit payments and other costs resulting from noncontributory coverage extended certain veterans as provided under section 217 (g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, $105,000,000.

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance", $381,000,000.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

GALLAUDET COLLEGE, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", $24,000.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Howard University, salaries and expenses", $216,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration", $13,000, together with not to exceed $53,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", $1,075,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

CHAPTER V

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Eva Hassell Bonner, widow of Herbert C. Bonner, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, $30,000.

For payment to Lera Millard Thomas, widow of Albert Thomas, late a Representative from the State of Texas, $30,000.

For payment to Mary I. Baldwin, widow of John F. Baldwin, late a Representative from the State of California, $30,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For an additional amount for "Capitol grounds", $17,000.

CHAPTER VI

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION

EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies", $7,750,000, to remain available until expended.

THE PANAMA CANAL

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", $300,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $520,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service", $450,000.

PAYMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, $45,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

In addition to the amount heretofore made available in the appropriation under this head for the current fiscal year for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), not to exceed $25,000 shall be available in such appropriation for such compensation and expenses.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", $475,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PATENT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $1,000,000.

THE JUDICIARY

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", $200,000.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and commissioners", $1,165,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $425,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Civil rights educational activities," including not to exceed $225,000 for salaries and expenses, $3,000,000.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $500,000.

CHAPTER VIII

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Operations", $269,904,000.

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for "Transportation", $21,000,000.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", $3,106,000.

CHAPTER IX

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,251,798, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in said judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further,* That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Joint Items:

"Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures", $945, to remain available until expended;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Joint Economic Committee", $9,000;

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", $8,250;

"Joint Committee on Printing", $3,750;

Contingent expenses of the House:

"Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation", $10,530;

"Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy", $655;

"Joint Committee on Defense Production", $2,160;

House:

"Compensation of Members", $7,500;

"Office of the Speaker", $3,155;

"Office of the Parliamentarian", $2,755;

"Compilation of Precedents", $270;

"Office of the Chaplain", $410;

"Office of the Clerk", $41,230;

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms", $28,205;

"Office of the Doorkeeper", $43,745;

"Office of the Postmaster", $13,825;

"Committee employees", $103,000;

"Six minority employees", $3,175;

"Majority floor leader", $2,340;

"Minority floor leader", $1,940;

"Majority whip", $1,565;

"Minority whip", $1,565;

"Printing clerks", $430;

"Technical assistant to attending physician", $385;

"Official reporters of debates", $6,880;

"Official reporters to committees", $6,940;

"Legislative counsel", $7,970;

"Members' clerk hire", $770,000;

"Special and select committees", $100,000;

"Coordinator of information", $3,675;

"Revision of the laws", $730;

"Speaker's auto", $330;

"Majority leader's auto", $330;

"Minority leader's auto", $330;

"Miscellaneous items", $19,000, for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812);

Architect of the Capitol:

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", $13,900;

Capitol buildings and grounds:

"Capitol buildings", $40,000;

"Capitol grounds", $10,000;

"Capitol power plant", $10,000;

"Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care", $13,000;

Botanic Garden: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000;

Library of Congress:

"Salaries and expenses", $256,700;

Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", $51,500;

Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", $62,200;

Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses", $65,300;

Books for the Blind: "Salaries and expenses", $6,600;

"Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)", $3,600;

Government Printing Office:

Office of Superintendent of Documents:

"Salaries and expenses": Not to exceed $65,000 of the reserve fund under this head for the current fiscal year may be used for increased pay costs authorized by law.

THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States:

"Salaries", $41,000;

"Care of Buildings and Grounds", $5,000;

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Customs Court: "Salaries and expenses", $19,000;

Court of Claims: "Salaries and expenses", $13,300;

Court of appeals; district courts, and other judicial services:

"Salaries of supporting personnel", $818,000;

"Administrative Office of the United States Courts", $31,000;

"Expenses of referees", $125,000, to be derived from the "Referees' salary and expense fund".

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The White House Office:

"Salaries and expenses", $85,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Special projects", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of the Budget: "Salaries and expenses", $131,000;

Council of Economic Advisers: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000;

National Security Council: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000;

Office of Emergency Planning: "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies", $86,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", fiscal year 1966;

Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic assistance:

"Administrative expenses", Agency for International Development, $980,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966;

"Administrative and other expenses", Department of State, $42,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service:

"Salaries and expenses", as follows:

"Research", $2,402,500; and

"Plant and animal disease and pest control", $1,268,500;

Cooperative State Research Service: "Payments and expenses", $32,000;

Extension Service: "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses": Of the amount made available under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, for "Payment to States

and Puerto Rico", $64,000 shall be transferred to the sub-appropriation for "Federal Extension Service";

Farmer Cooperative Service: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

Soil Conservation Service:

"Conservation operations", $2,608,000;

"Watershed planning", $140,000, to remain available until expended;

"Watershed protection", $585,000, to remain available until expended;

"Flood prevention", $160,000, to remain available until expended;

"Great Plains conservation program", $82,000, to remain available until expended;

"Resource conservation and development", $46,000, to remain available until expended;

Economic Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", $246,000;

Statistical Reporting Service: "Salaries and expenses". $250,000;

Consumer and Marketing Service: "Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", $1,905,000;

Foreign Agricultural Service: "Salaries and expenses". $178,000;

Commodity Exchange Authority: "Salaries and expenses", $28,000;

Rural Electrification Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $268,000;

Farmers Home Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: "Administrative and operating expenses", $202,000;

Rural Community Development Service: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

Office of the Inspector General: "Salaries and expenses", $145,000;

Office of the General Counsel: "Salaries and expenses", $102,000;

Office of Information: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

National Agricultural Library: "Salaries and expenses", $36,000;

Office of Management Services: "Salaries and expenses", $59,000;

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000;

Forest Service: "Forest roads and trails (liquidation of

contract authorization)", $964,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $89,000;

Office of Business Economics: "Salaries and expenses", $50,000;

Bureau of the Census:

"Salaries and expenses", $320,000;

"1964 Census of Agriculture", $110,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967;

Business and Defense Services Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $125,000;

International Activities:

"Salaries and expenses", $160,000, of which $23,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1967:

"Export control", $100,000, of which $33,400 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs;

Office of Field Services: "Salaries and expenses", $90,000;

Coast and Geodetic Survey: "Salaries and expenses", $510,000;

National Bureau of Standards: "Research and technical services", $500,000;

Weather Bureau:

"Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;

"Research and development", $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968;

"Meteorological satellite operations", $48,000, to remain available until expended;

Maritime Administration:

"Salaries and expenses", $222,000, of which $200,000 is for administrative expenses and $22,000 is for reserve fleet expenses;

"Maritime training", $38,000;

Bureau of Public Roads: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $950,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administration and research).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Military personnel:

"Military personnel, Army", $222,100,000;

"Military personnel, Navy", $182,600,000;

"Military personnel, Marine Corps", $42,400,000;

"Military personnel, Air Force", $227,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Navy", $4,600,000:

"Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", $1,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Air Force", $1,200,000;

"National Guard personnel, Army", $4,500,000;

"National Guard personnel, Air Force", $3,500,000;

"Retired pay, Defense", $71,000,000;

Operation and maintenance:

"Operation and maintenance, Army", $33,400,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Navy", $23,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", $1,054,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air Force", $27,600,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", $14,356,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", $2,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard", $1,000,000;

"Court of Military Appeals, Defense", $11,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army:

Cemeterial expenses: "Salaries and expenses", $67,000;

Corps of Engineers—Civil: "General expenses", $385,000;

Ryukyu Islands, Army: "Administration", $40,000;

The Panama Canal:

Panama Canal Company: "Limitation on general and administrative expenses" (increase of $137,000 in the limitation on the amount available for general and administrative expenses);

United States Soldiers' Home: "Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay" (increase of $146,000 in the amount available for maintenance and operation to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service:

"Hospitals and medical care", $770,000;

"Foreign quarantine activities", $212,000;

"Indian health activities", $1,355,000;

Saint Elizabeths Hospital: "Salaries and expenses", the total amount available for "Salaries and expenses" in the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966", is hereby increased from $29,886,000 to $30,613,000;

Social Security Administration: "Limitation on salaries

and expenses, Social Security Administration" (increase of $8,037,000 in the amount to be expended, as authorized by section 201 (g) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein) ;

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $18,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund;

"Surplus property utilization", $20,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Federal Housing Administration: "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration" (increases of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses) ;

Public Housing Administration:

"Administrative expenses", $405,000;

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Public Housing Administration" (increase of $405,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses).

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs:

"Education and welfare services", $1,202,400;

"General administrative expenses", $103,000;

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Office of Territories: "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands", $102,600;

Mineral Resources:

Geological Survey: "Surveys, investigations, and research", $1,510,000;

Bureau of Mines:

"Conservation and development of mineral resources", $500,000;

"Health and safety", $92,000;

"General administrative expenses", $22,000;

Office of Oil and Gas: "Salaries and expenses", $16,300;

Fish and Wildlife Service:

Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: "Salaries and expenses", $8,500;

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

"Management and investigation of resources", $86,800, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development", fiscal year 1966;

"General administrative expenses", $15,000;

"Administration of Pribilof Islands", $10,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: "General administrative expenses", $34,300;

National Park Service: "General administrative expenses", $57,000;

Bureau of Reclamation: "General administrative expenses", $241,200, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operation and maintenance", fiscal year 1966;

Bonneville Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $173,000;

Southwestern Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $25,300;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $109,800;

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $105,000;

Office of Water Resources Research: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration:

Alien property activities: "Limitation on general

administrative expenses" (increase of $7,000 in the amount for general administrative expenses);

"Salaries and expenses, antitrust division", $45,000;

"Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", $647,000;

Federal Bureau of Investigation: "Salaries and expenses", $3,735,000;

Immigration and Naturalization Service: "Salaries and expenses", $1,782,000;

Federal Prison System: "Salaries and expenses", $1,035,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration:

Office of Manpower Administrator: "Salaries and expenses", $66,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Manpower development and training activities", $25,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training: "Salaries and expenses", $87,000, to be derived by transfer from

the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Wage and Labor Standards:

Bureau of Labor Standards: "Salaries and expenses", $39,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Women's Bureau: "Salaries and expenses", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Employees' Compensation: "Salaries and expenses", $58,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $1,550 to be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 944);

Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Salaries and expenses", $242,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of International Labor Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," fiscal year 1966;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $3,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, unemployment trust fund;

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $35,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Federal contract compliance program", $7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

"Administration and regional operation", $1,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,760,000, of which $1,299,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966, and $123,600 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Extension and remodeling, State Department Building";

International organizations and conferences: "Missions to international organizations", $59,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966;

International commissions:

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: "Salaries and expenses", $17,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $138,000;

Bureau of Customs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,043,000;

Bureau of Narcotics: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

Bureau of the Public Debt: "Administering the public debt", $360,000;

Coast Guard:

"Operating expenses", $9,400,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966;

"Retired pay", $1,000,000;

"Reserve training", $1,050,000;

Internal Revenue Service:

"Salaries and expenses", $381,000;

"Revenue accounting and processing", $3,472,000;

"Compliance", $9,305,000;

Office of the Treasurer: "Salaries and expenses", $60,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

United States Secret Service: "Salaries and expenses, guard force", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, United States Secret Service", fiscal year 1966.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

"Operations", $9,500,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport", $54,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport", $62,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", $4,600,000;

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service", $861,000, of which $55,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966;

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", $336,000;

"Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service", $135,000, of which $45,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966, and $90,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966;

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", $33,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"General operating expenses", $1,000,000;

"Medical and prosthetic research", $365,000:

"Medical care", $17,456,000.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Civil Aeronautics Board: "Salaries and expenses", $240,000;

Civil Service Commission:

"Salaries and expenses", $528,000, and in addition $15,000 may be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations";

"Limitation on administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund" (increase of $6,200 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Farm Credit Administration: "Limitation on administrative expenses" (increase of $28,000 in the limi-

tation on the amount available for administrative expenses) ;

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: "Salaries and expenses", $1,500;

Federal Communications Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $346,000;

Federal Home Loan Bank Board:

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (increase of $75,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses) ;

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation" (increase of $6,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses) ;

Federal Maritime Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: "Salaries and expenses", $115,000;

Federal Power Commission: "Salaries and expenses". $300,000;

Federal Trade Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $312,500;

General Accounting Office: "Salaries and expenses", $535,000;

Intergovernmental commissions:

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Interstate Commerce Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $625,000;

National Labor Relations Board: "Salaries and expenses", $548,100;

National Mediation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $27,000;

Renegotiation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $30,000;

Small Business Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $150,000;

Smithsonian Institution:

"Salaries and expenses", $453,000;

"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", $66,000;

Tariff Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $46,000;

Tax Court of the United States: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

United States Information Agency: "Salaries and expenses", $1,005,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

Operating expenses:

"General operating expenses", $325,800, of which $4,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $1,400 from the motor vehicle parking account), $800 from the water fund, and $100 from the sanitary sewage works fund;

"Health and welfare", $920,500;

"Highways and traffic", $95,900, of which $78,000 shall be payable from the highway fund;

"Sanitary engineering", $253,000, of which $59,300 shall be payable from the water fund and $20,700 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1966.

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 202. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations

or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1966, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Passed the House of Representatives March 29, 1966.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14012

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

APRIL 1, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

H. R. 14012

AN ACT

12. FARM LABOR. Rep. Bennett defended the Secretary of Labor against "attacks" made against him regarding the requirements he issued for employers wishing to remain eligible for foreign agricultural workers. p. 8398

13. FOOD PRICES. Rep. Findley inserted a letter to this Department from the Illinois Pork Producers Assoc. complaining about the Government's "decision to cut back on purchases of pork because of present prices." p. 8429
Rep. Langen inserted an article, "Cooley Protests Farm Price Rollback--Proposes Cut in Government Spending as Inflation Check." pp. 8431-2

14. PUBLIC LAW 480. Both Houses received a GAO report of "review of the expedited signing of certain agreements under title I of the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954." pp. 8439, 8444

15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that on Tues. the House will consider the agricultural appropriation bill. p. D344

SENATE (Continued)

16. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported (during adjournment) H. R. 14012, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1966 (S. Rept. 1137). Amounts provided for each item for this Department were the same as the budget requests. A summary of Senate committee action compared with Budget Estimates and House Bill follows:

Item	Budget Estimate	House Bill	Senate Committee Bill	Senate Committee Bill Compared with House Bill
Pay Costs	$15,841,000	$15,841,000	$15,841,000	----
Fighting Forest Fires	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	----
Emergency credit revolving fund	30,000,000	a/	30,000,000	+30,000,000

a/ This estimate sent directly to the Senate in S. Doc. 85.

For details of the amounts requested by each agency for pay costs see Digests 29 and 30.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

17. FARM LABOR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Talcott criticizing the administration's farm labor policies, and inserting an article, "Where Do We Go From Here, Mr. Wirtz?" pp. A2206-7

18. FARM PRICES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Langen inserting a letter which "puts the plight of the farmer in terse, down-to-earth language." pp. A2207-8

19. EDUCATION; FEDERAL AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Berry inserting fact sheets on proposed changes in aid to federally impacted school districts. p. A2208

20. INFORMATION. Rep. Adair inserted an article, "Remove Barriers To News", favoring the proposed freedom-of-information bill. p. A2210

21. CHILD NUTRITION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Fraser favoring and expressing the need for the proposed Child Nutrition Act. p. A2215

22. CONSUMERS; LABELING. Rep. Sullivan inserted her address before the Consumer Assembly, Who Should Do The Testing of Products for Safety--the Manufacturers, or You?" pp. A2216-8

BILLS INTRODUCED

23. DAIRY PRODUCTS. S. 3273 by Sen. Proxmire, to regulate imports of milk and dairy products; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author p. 8448

24. MANPOWER. H. R. 14601 by Rep. Hosmer, to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on American Manpower and National Security; to Rules Committee.

25. TOBACCO. H. R. 14603 by Rep. Watts, to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to Agriculture Committee.

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

26. WATER RESEARCH. S. 22, to authorize appropriation of $85 million over a 10-year period to the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to, and finance contracts and matching or other arrangements with, educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions, private firms and individuals, and local, State, and Federal agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Interior Department. Approved April 19, 1966 (Public Law 89-404).

27. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME. S. 1404, the proposed Uniform Time Act of 1966, to establish uniform dates (from the last Sunday of Apr. to the last Sunday of Oct. each year) for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in all States and jurisdictions where it is observed. Approved Apr. 13, 1966 (Public Law 89-387).

28. TARIFF. H. R. 6568, to make permanent the duty-free treatment or lower rates of duty temporarily applicable to copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, their oils, and specified fatty acids, salts, and other chemical products derived from the oils. Approved Apr. 13, 1966 (Public Law 89-388).

H. R. 7723, to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods until Jan. 1, 1968. Approved Apr. 14, 1966 (Public Law 89-392).

H. R. 11029, to increase the tariff rates on fabrics made of a mixture of ramie, rayon, or other manmade fibers with cotton, and fabrics made of blended yarn containing small amounts of high-value rabbit hair and a large amount of low-value reprocessed wool. Approved Apr. 19, 1966 (Public Law 89-405).

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS:

April 26: Cotton promotion bill, S. Agriculture.
Sales participation, S. Banking and Currency.
Pay bill, S. Civil Service.
War on hunger, H. Agriculture (exec).
Foreign aid, H. Foreign Affairs (exec).

April 30: National forest matters in Lake Tahoe area, H. Public Works (Connaughten, FS, to testify at field hearings).

oOo

Calendar No. 1103

89TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 1137

THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

APRIL 25, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14012]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 14012) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House	$2,564,872,568
Amount of increase by Senate committee	236,253,435
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	2,801,126,003
Total estimates considered by the Senate	[1] 3,020,810,903
Under budget estimates	219,684,900

[1] Includes $207,258,735 submitted directly to the Senate and not considered by the House.

50-010—66——1

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL BY CHAPTER

Chapter	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE I					
I	Agriculture	$30, 000, 000	----------	$30, 000, 000	----------	+$30, 000, 000
II	District of Columbia	2, 300, 000	$1, 250, 000	1, 250, 000	−$1, 050, 000	----------
III	Foriegn Operations	140, 000, 000	----------	140, 000, 000	----------	+140, 000, 000
IV	Independent Offices	383, 693, 000	348, 280, 000	383, 693, 000	----------	+35, 413, 000
V	Interior	26, 421, 000	22, 495, 000	26, 255, 700	−165, 300	+3, 760, 700
VI	Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare	1, 106, 442, 000	902, 528, 000	902, 028, 000	−204, 414, 000	−500, 000
VII	Legislative	17, 000	107, 000	307, 000	+290, 000	+200, 000
VIII	Public Works	16, 024, 000	15, 570, 000	15, 920, 000	−104, 000	+350, 000
IX	State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary	12, 682, 000	7, 260, 000	12, 020, 000	−662, 000	+4, 760, 000
X	Post Office	321, 010, 000	294, 010, 000	319, 010, 000	−2, 000, 000	+25, 000, 000
XI	Claims and judgments	10, 828, 683	10, 251, 798	10, 828, 683	----------	+576, 885
	Total, title I	2, 049, 417, 683	1, 601, 751, 798	1, 841, 312, 383	−208, 105, 300	+239, 560, 585

	TITLE II					
	Increased pay costs	971, 393, 220	963, 120, 770	959, 813, 620	−11, 579, 600	−3, 307, 150
	Grand total:					
	Direct appropriations	3, 019, 990, 903	2, 564, 052, 568	2, 800, 306, 003	−219, 684, 900	+236, 253, 435
	Appropriation of receipts	10, 000	10, 000	10, 000		
	Special accounts	125, 000	125, 000	125, 000		
	Indefinite appropriations	685, 000	685, 000	685, 000		
	Contract authorization	(*30, 000, 000*)	(*12, 000, 000*)			
	Total	3, 020, 810, 903	2, 564, 872, 568	2, 801, 126, 003	−219, 684, 900	+236, 253, 435

TITLE I

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Farmers Home Administration

EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

1966 appropriation act	None
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	$30, 000, 000
House bill	None
Committee recommendation	30, 000, 000

The committee recommends a supplemental appropriation of $30,000,000, as proposed in Senate Document 85, to increase the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund established pursuant to section 327(b) of the consolidated FHA Act of 1961, as amended. The unprecedented and unforeseen damages occasioned by Hurricane Betsy in the Southeast and the recent snowstorms in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota are estimated to create loan demands exceeding the currently available assets of the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund between now and the end of fiscal 1966. Section 4 of Public Law 89–339 authorized emergency FHA loans for eligible borrowers in Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi who suffered losses from this hurricane, without regard to the borrower's ability to obtain credit from other sources. Hurricane Betsy loans are now estimated at $27 million, and snow disaster loans are now estimated at $16 million. Other disaster funds may be needed between now and the end of this fiscal year, and therefore the committee has included the full amount requested to enable the agency to make loans as required to eligible applicants in these and other properly designated disaster areas.

CHAPTER II

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the District of Columbia, the committee agrees to the House allowance of $1,250,000, as additional Federal payment in fiscal year 1966; also the appropriation, from revenues of the District, of $1,459,800 for increased operating expenses in public safety and parks and recreation activities.

Distribution of the allowance, by appropriation, follows:

FEDERAL PAYMENT

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$2,300,000
House allowance	1,250,000
Committee recommendation	1,250,000

The additional Federal payment of $1,250,000, together with the $43,000,000 allowed in the regular 1966 appropriation bill, provides a total payment of $44,250,000 to the general fund of the District of Columbia. This sum is $5,750,000 under the current authorization of $50,000,000.

The additional $1,250,000 is necessary to help finance the increased pay, overtime, and wage-board costs of District government personnel, and to maintain sufficient reserve in the general funds account to meet the costs of corporation refunds, indefinite appropriations and miscellaneous items this current fiscal year.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	($1,249,200)
House allowance	(1,249,200)
Committee recommendation	(1,249,200)

The allowance of $1,249,200 will provide $426,500 for cost of pay increases authorized by Public Law 89–301; $16,700 for cost of wage-board increases; and $806,000 for overtime pay of policemen and firemen as authorized by Public Law 89–282.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	($210,600)
House allowance	(210,600)
Committee recommendation	(210,600)

The allowance of $210,600 will provide $107,700 for costs of pay increases under authority of Public Law 89–301; $82,500 for cost of wage-board increases; and $20,400 for overtime pay of park policemen, in accord with Public Law 89–282.

CHAPTER III

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Funds Appropriated to the President

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	$140, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	140, 000, 000

The committee recommendation of $140,000,000 for this item is the full amount of the budget estimate. There is no House allowance for this item because it was not considered by the House since the legislation authorizing funds to be appropriated was enacted shortly before the House had taken action on the appropriation bill.

Public Law 89–360, which was enacted by the Congress on March 16, 1966, authorizes a subscription of $200,000,000 by the United States to the Asian Development Bank's total capital stock of $1,000,000,000. The United States subscription consists of $100,000,000 to the callable capital, which is to be subscribed in full, and $100,000,000 to the paid-in capital which is to be paid in five equal annual installments.

The amount allowed by the committee provides funds for the full amount of the subscription to callable capital and for payment of the first two installments, of $20,000,000 each, on the Bank's paid-in capital. Actual dollar disbursements to cover the callable capital subscription will not be made until such time as the Bank finds it necessary to make a "call," which should not materialize as long as the Bank is operating successfully.

CHAPTER IV

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

National Capital Housing Authority

Appropriation, 1966 (regular act)	$37,000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	12,000
(Not considered by House)	-------
Committee recommendation	12,000

The committee recommends inserting a new item for an additional amount of $12,000 for operation and maintenance of properties, as requested in Senate Document 85, to cover the cost of the emergency replacement of a boiler in a unit of the public housing properties operated by the Authority.

Selective Service System

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966 (regular act)	$49,250,000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 380)	12,681,000
House allowance	10,180,000
Committee recommendation	12,681,000

Restoration of $2,501,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the supplemental estimate of $12,681,000, of which $1,087,000 was for civilian and military pay costs and $11,594,000 was for increased workload caused by accelerated inductions. Inductions for fiscal year 1966 are now estimated at 360,000, as compared to the estimate of 125,000 upon which the original appropriation was based. The committee is advised that while the call fell off by some 15,000 for the month of April, the call for May is back to 34,600, as estimated for the increased workload.

Veterans' Administration

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966 (regular act)	$160,238,000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	3,000,000
(Not considered by House)	----------
Committee recommendation	3,000,000

The committee recommends inserting a new item for an additional amount of $3,000,000 for general operating expenses, as requested in Senate Document 85, to cover the administrative costs of handling inquiries and applications for benefits under the new GI bill. The Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–358, approved March 3, 1966) authorizes educational assistance, home loans, loan guarantees, and other benefits for veterans who served after January 31, 1955.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

Appropriation, 1966 (regular act)	$4, 142, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	288, 000, 000
House allowance	288, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	288, 000, 000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of the full amount of the supplemental estimate of $288,000,000 additional for compensation and pensions, to provide for increased costs resulting mainly from new legislative enactments which increased disability compensation rates, liberalized compensation and pensions benefits and added death gratuity payments, as well as increases in normal caseloads.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Appropriation, 1966 (regular act)	$36, 500, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	5, 000, 000
House allowance	5, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	5, 000, 000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of the full amount of the supplemental estimate of $5,000,000 additional for readjustment benefits, to provide for increased costs resulting from new legislative enactments which increased the monthly payment to war orphans in training and extended the time available for seriously disabled veterans to pursue vocational rehabilitation training.

Funds Appropriated to the President

DISASTER RELIEF

Appropriation, 1966 (regular act)	$55, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	75, 000, 000
House allowance	45, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	75, 000, 000

Restoration of $30,000,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the supplemental estimate of $75,000,000 for disaster relief. The committee is advised that at the time the supplemental estimate was submitted, $62,500,000 was required to fund then existing obligations, with a carryover of $12,500,000 for the remainder of fiscal year 1966. Since then, however, increased requirements in Texas, Missouri, California, and Louisiana, as well as new disasters in Georgia, Minnesota, North Dakota, and American Samoa, have canceled out the contemplated carryover, and the full $75,000,000 is now needed to pay bills and commitments already incurred, with no provision for carryover.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

The committee considered the supplemental budget estimate of $30,000,000 in contract authorization for fiscal year 1966, in accordance with section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. This estimate was intended to provide appropriation act

approval to implement the program for annual rent supplement payments on 50,000 housing units. The House has approved $12,000,000 for 20,000 housing units.

The committee has voted to eliminate the item from the supplemental bill for 1966. Further consideration of the program is scheduled before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations in connection with estimates for 1967.

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

The committee considered the request in Senate Document 85 to add language authorizing as nonadministrative expenses the funds required to conduct a comprehensive study of the savings and loan industry and ways in which its operations and the governmental supervisory process can be improved. At the request of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the committee denies the request without prejudice in order to allow consideration of this request by that committee.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

1966 appropriations to date	$49, 080, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	1, 495, 000
House allowanse	1, 495, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 495, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of $1,495,000 for this appropriation, which is the amount of the supplemental request. Of this amount, $1,000,000 is to cover firefighting and rehabilitation costs on public lands in the Western States and Alaska, and $495,000 is to cover part of the increased departmental pay costs authorized in Public Law 89–301.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

1966 appropriations to date	$42, 796, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	755, 000
House allowance	755, 000
Committee recommendation	755, 000

The amount of the request and the House allowance, $755,000, is recommended by the committee. For costs of fire suppression and emergency prevention of fires on, or threatening, forest and range lands of Indian reservations, $186,000 is approved and $569,000 is to cover increased pay costs as authorized by the Congress last year in Public Law 89–301.

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

1966 appropriations to date	$32, 366, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	1, 307, 000
House allowance	1, 028, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 245, 000

For management and protection services of the National Park Service, the committee recommends $1,245,000. This is $62,000 below the supplemental estimate and $217,000 over the House allowance.

Of the total amount recommended by the committee, $245,000 is to cover emergency fire suppression expenses incurred last summer and to meet anticipated expenses in the balance of fiscal year 1966; $741,000 is for increased pay and associated costs; and $42,000 is for

compensation to park police for overtime work, authorized in Public Law 89–282.

The committee has also allowed $217,000 for expenses incidental to staffing requirements for new park areas.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

1966 appropriations to date	$24, 660, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	924, 000
House allowance	827, 000
Committee recommendation	892, 000

For maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities, the committee recommends $892,000, which is $32,000 under the supplemental estimate and $65,000 over the House allowance.

The amount approved by the committee allows, as requested in the estimate, $724,000 for mandatory wage-board increases, $103,000 for increased pay costs authorized in Public Law 89–301, and $65,000 for requirements in new park areas.

CONSTRUCTION

1966 appropriations to date	$26, 177, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	1, 169, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	[1] 542, 000
House allowance	900, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 711, 000

[1] Not considered by the House.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1,711,000 for this item, which is the total of the two estimates submitted, but $811,000 over the $900,000 allowance by the House. These funds will provide for the reconstruction of roads and other facilities damaged by hurricanes, floods, storms, and other such causes.

The committee has considered an additional estimate, contained in Senate Document 85, providing for similar reconstruction work in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The damage in this area occurred in mid-February; and the estimate of damage was not available in time for submission to the House of Representatives. With these additional funds, it is expected that the facilities will be repaired quickly in order to permit full use of the facilities as soon as possible.

CONSTRUCTION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

1966 appropriations to date	$33, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	5, 500, 000
House allowance	5, 500, 000
Committee recommendation	5, 500, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of $5,500,000 for the liquidation of obligations under the contract authority granted in the Federal Aid Highway Act.

Office of Territories

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

1966 appropriations to date	$14, 579, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	2, 500, 000
House allowance	[1]
Committee recommendation	2, 500, 000

[1] Not considered.

The committee recommends the full estimate of $2,500,000 for this appropriation. These funds will establish for American Samoa a housing loan program for construction of houses for Samoans whose homes were destroyed by a hurricane on January 31, 1966. Housing replacements will be financed from this loan fund, together with a grant by the Office of Emergency Planning.

Fish and Wildlife Service

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATION OF RESOURCES

1966 appropriations to date	$21, 838, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	203, 000
House allowance	148, 000
Committee recommendation	193, 000

For management and investigation of recourses, the committee recommends $193,000, which is $10,000 below the amount originally requested and $45,000 over the House allowance.

This sum will provide funds to finance increased pay and associated costs resulting from the enactment of Public Law 89–301 and, with the restoration of $45,000, will provide funds necessary to increase the monitoring of pesticides in the marine areas along the coasts and in the Great Lakes, which have been carried there by way of the watersheds from forest and agricultural areas.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATION OF RESOURCES

1966 appropriations to date	$36, 134, 300
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	763, 000
House allowance	658, 000
Committee recommendation	712, 700

For this appropriation, the committee recommends $712,700. This is $54,700 over the House allowance but $50,300 under the original supplemental request.

This appropriation will provide for the following: $478,000 for civilian pay and associated costs as authorized by law, $180,000 for wage-board increases, and $54,700 for pesticides research.

This funding for pesticides research will permit the agency to recruit most of the staff of two new major facilities, who will receive on-the-job training at existing laboratories pending completion of the new laboratories early in fiscal 1967.

The committee was assured by the Bureau, after a review of its original request, instigated by the committee, that this lesser amount

would be sufficient to give the agency essential leadtime for staffing and an opportunity to compete immediately with other agencies recruiting for the best qualified graduates in the pesticide and wildlife research fields.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT

1966 appropriations to date	$162, 318, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	9, 635, 000
House allowance	9, 635, 000
Committee recommendation	9, 635, 000

FOREST RESEARCH

1966 appropriations to date	36, 764, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	610, 000
House allowance	610, 000
Committee recommendation	610, 000

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

1966 appropriations to date	17, 513, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	45, 000
House allowance	45, 000
Committee recommendation	45, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of $10,290,000 for forest protection and utilization, apportioned as above, which provides necessary funds for fighting forest fires and for increased pay and associated costs as authorized by Public Law 89–301.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1966 appropriations to date	$71, 500
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	29, 000
House allowance	[1]
Committee recommendation	18, 000

[1] Not considered.

The committee recommends $18,000 for the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, which is $11,000 under the supplemental estimate.

These funds are necessary to finance additional estimated costs of the increased workload and personnel costs required by the enactment in March of this year of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1966 appropriations to date	$800, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	68, 000
House allowance	18, 000
Committee recommendation	68, 000

The committee recommends $68,000 for the National Capital Planning Commission, concurring in the House allowance of $18,000 for pay and associated costs authorized by law, but restoring the $50,000 requested for printing costs.

According to testimony presented to the committee, $20,000 is required to finance publication of the Commission's "Proposed 1985 Comprehensive Plan," and the remainder will be used for printing of completed consultants' and special staff reports.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

1966 appropriations to date	$4,500,000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	876,000
House allowance	876,000
Committee recommendation	876,000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of $876,000 for this item, which is the amount of the supplemental request. This will complete the payment of grants authorized in Public Law 88–311, to assist the State of Alaska in recovering from the March 27 earthquake in 1964. The sum of $17 million was appropriated for this purpose in 1964.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

1966 appropriation to date	None
Supplemental estimate	$10,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000

The committee recommends $1 million, the House allowance, a reduction of $9 million from the supplemental estimate. The Department did not seek restoration of the amount disallowed by the House.

The funds here recommended will provide $750,000 for readjustment allowance payments for an estimated 700 eligible workers, and $250,000 for State administrative costs.

The trade readjustment allowance payable to an adversely affected worker for a week of unemployment shall be an amount equal to 65 percent of his average weekly wage, or to 65 percent of the average weekly manufacturing wage, whichever is less; an average payment of $70 a week is contemplated.

A relocation allowance to assist adversely affected workers who are heads of families and totally separated from their employment is authorized and $44,000 is contemplated for the relocation of 30 workers.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1966 appropriation to date	$18,438,200
Supplemental estimate	1,043,000
House allowance	1,028,000
Committee recommendation	1,028,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1,028,000, and 58 positions, the House allowance, a reduction of $15,000 and 2 positions, from the budget request. The Department did not seek restoration of the slight reduction made by the House.

The funds here recommended will provide $238,000 for pay act increases—the total cost of the pay increase is $421,600 of which the Department will absorb $183,600; and $790,000 to enable the U.S. Employment Service to meet effectively the increased workload which will result from the recently enacted Immigration and Nationality Act.

Wage and Labor Standards

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1966 appropriation to date	$20,905,000
Supplemental estimate	614,000
House allowance	614,000
Committee recommendation	614,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $614,000, the amount of the supplemental estimate and the House allowance.

For increased pay costs which amounted to $478,000, the Department absorbed $214,000, and there is included in the committee recommendation $264,000.

The allowance also provides $350,000 for increased workload in the enforcement activity resulting from the Service Contract Act of 1965, effective January 20, 1966. This act provides labor standards for the protection of employees of contractors and subcontractors furnishing services to Federal agencies.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1966 appropriation to date	$252,491,000
Supplemental estimate	950,000
House allowance	950,000
Committee recommendation	950,000

The committee recommends approval of the House allowance and supplemental estimate of $950,000.

The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 authorizes $1,875,000 for making advances to State and nonprofit student loan guarantee programs to establish loan insurance programs for students who wish to attend postsecondary, business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. The bill includes $850,000 for fiscal year 1966 with the balance to be requested for fiscal year 1967. There is also included $100,000 to pay the interest on an estimated 15,000 loans to students at an average loan of $200 as authorized by the act.

The act also provides that funds made available for interest payments shall remain available until expended and advances for reserve funds shall remain available until June 30, 1968. The bill, however, contains a general provision limiting the availability of funds contained therein to the current fiscal year unless otherwise provided therein.

The committee has included the necessary language to provide for continued availability of funds beyond the current fiscal year in accordance with the authorization inasmuch as the program has not developed to the point where a firm estimate of funds required in the current fiscal year can be made.

VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

1966 appropriation to date	None
Supplemental estimate	$50,000
House allowance	50,000
Committee recommendation	50,000

The committee recommends the House allowance and estimate of $50,000 to establish an insurance reserve fund to assure lending institutions of the adequacy of the Federal insurance program in accordance with section 13 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

A charge of one-fourth of 1 percent of all outstanding loans insured by the Federal Government will be made to all lending agencies to which insurance certificates are issued. An estimated 5,000 loans at an average of $200 will be insured in fiscal year 1966. With an estimated default of 1 percent, $10,000 will be required for default payments, and $40,000 will remain in the fund. The insurance premiums will be used to strengthen the insurance fund.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1966 appropriation to date	$967, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate	184, 000, 000
House allowance	184, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	184, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $184 million, the amount of the supplemental estimate and the amount allowed by the House, for basic grants under title I.

The original appropriation for meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children provided $775,000,000, with a proviso that determinations and payments under the title shall be on the basis of the amount authorized to be appropriated for such title, estimated at that time to be approximately $1,170,000,000, but at this time estimated to be approximately $1,190,000,000. The proviso gave implied assurance that whatever additional sums were required within each State's entitlement would be made available.

The Department, with concurrence from the Bureau of the Budget, determined that the proviso above cited constituted contract authority—new authorization to incur obligations in advance of an appropriation, and has proceeded on such a basis since the original appropriation of $775 million was fully obligated in early March.

In view of this committee the proviso included in the original appropriation does not constitute authority, and in consequence the committee has added language to ratify and confirm obligations incurred from March 1, 1966, to the date of enactment of this act.

The $184 million here recommended together with the $775 million heretofore appropriated provides $959 million for basic grants under title I. The Department has advised the committee of the distribution among the several States it proposes to make of these funds, which amount to 80.57 percent of the total entitlements. The distribution is not a proportional one, but is made on the basis of the first projects approved, the first projects funded. The result is that 29 States will receive less than their proportionate share, with two receiving less than 50 percent, and 11 receiving in excess of 95 percent.

This maldistribution coupled with the implied assurance that any additional funds required would be appropriated has led the committee to recommend contract authority for the obligation of the remainder of the authorization, some $231 million, leaving to the State the determination of how much of its allotment it wishes to use, without a time limit on its approval of projects to be initiated within the fiscal year.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1966 appropriation to date	$160, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate	11, 000, 000
House allowance	11, 300, 000
Committee recommendation	11, 300, 000

The committee recommends $11,300,000, the House allowance, and an increase of $300,000 above the supplemental request.

Title II, part A, of the Higher Education Act of 1965 provides for grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of library resources and authorizes $50 million for fiscal year 1966 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years. The bill contains $11 million for this purpose.

The House increased the estimate by $300,000 to allow the Library of Congress to initiate the acquisition and cataloging of foreign language library materials of value to scholars. The committee concurs with this allowance in excess of the budget estimate.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

1966 appropriation to date	None
Supplemental estimate	$13, 200, 000
House allowance	10, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	9, 500, 000

The committee recommends $9,500,000, which is $3,700,000 less than the supplemental estimate and $500,000 less than the House allowance.

The estimate contemplated $8,850,000 for training teachers, $2,475,000 for local school district administration, and $1,875,000 for relocation expenses for teachers assigned to local school districts. The House allowance would provide $7,200,000 for training, $1,300,000 for local school district administration, and $1,500,000 for relocation expenses of teachers assigned to local school districts. The committee has reduced the latter two items $250,000 each on the basis that current program plans call for a later start in the training activity than was originally contemplated and therefore there would not be a need for all of the funds requested for local school district administration and relocation expenses in fiscal year 1966.

The funds approved by the committee would still provide for $1,050,000 for local school district administration, $1,250,000 for relocation expenses of trainees and teachers, and $7,200,000 for training.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1966 appropriation to date	$347, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate	None
House allowance	41, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	41, 000, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance of $41 million which is an increase over the amount appropriated for 1966 to date, notwithstanding the Department's request that this allowance be eliminated.

Amendments to Public Law 874 for payments to school districts enacted late in the last session of Congress and increased per pupil costs are responsible for the need of approximately $41 million to cover full entitlement under this law. Congress has time and again evidenced willingness to support this program at 100 percent of entitlement and the funds included herein are designed to accomplish this purpose.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

GRANTS TO STATES

1966 appropriation to date	$132, 310, 000
Supplemental estimate	39, 000, 000
House allowance	39, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	39, 000, 000

The committee recommends $39,000,000, the amount of the supplemental estimate and the House allowance.

These funds are for grants to States to carry out the 1965 amendments to section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act enacted by the last session of Congress. These amendments liberalized the matching provisions and revised the allotment formula. The rate of Federal sharing in the cost of rehabilitation services was changed to provide for two annual increases up to 75 percent for all States by 1967. The change for 1966 will increase the average Federal matching rate from about 62 to 68 percent of the cost of rehabilitation services. It is estimated that the funds provided in the bill will increase the total number of rehabilitants from 145,000 to 168,500 for fiscal year 1966.

Public Health Service

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

1966 appropriation to date	$5, 510, 000
Supplemental estimate	4, 175, 000
House allowance	4, 175, 000
Committee recommendations	4, 175, 000

The committee recommends the supplemental estimate and House allowance of $4,175,000 to initiate the programs authorized by the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 enacted by the last session of Congress.

The act provided for making grants to appropriate public or private nonprofit institutions and entering into contracts for purposes of carrying out projects of research and investigations in the field of medical library science and related activities, and for the development of new techniques, systems and equipment for processing, storing, retrieving, and distributing information pertaining to sciences relating to health.

Social Security Administration

PAYMENTS TO TRUST FUNDS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

1966 appropriation to date	None
Supplemental estimate	$367, 800, 000
House allowance	125, 800, 000
Committee recommendation	125, 800, 000

The committee recommends $125,800,000, the amount of the House allowance and a reduction of $242,000,000 from the supplemental estimate. The Department did not appeal for restoration of the reduction made by the House.

Funds included allow the full $25,800,000 requested in the estimate for reimbursements to the trust fund for administrative expenses in connection with hospital insurance for individuals uninsured for cash benefit programs as authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

That act also authorizes an appropriation to provide an operating fund to assure prompt payment of benefits in the early months of the supplementary medical insurance program and to provide a contingency reserve. The committee believes that the $100,000,000 included is sufficient to establish this contingency reserve. These funds are repayable to the Treasury.

PAYMENTS FOR MILITARY SERVICE CREDITS

1966 appropriation to date	None
Supplemental estimate	$105, 000, 000
House allowance	105, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	105, 000, 000

The committee recommends $105,000,000, the full amount of the supplemental estimate and House allowance.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 authorize reimbursement to the old age and survivors insurance trust fund and, where applicable, the disability insurance trust fund, and the Federal hospital insurance trust fund, for costs incurred since September, 1950, for benefit payments—and related administrative and interest costs—based on noncontributory military service credits. The act also established a 50-year period ending June 30, 2015, for reimbursement. Thereafter annual appropriations for current costs are authorized. The funds included for 1966 constitute the first annual reimbursement for these purposes.

Welfare Administration

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

1966 appropriation to date	$3, 222, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate	381, 000, 000
House allowance	381, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	381, 000, 000

The committee recommends $381,000,000 which is the amount of the supplemental estimate and the House allowance.

The Social Security Act, as amended, requires Federal financial participation in a specified portion of State expenditures for public assistance in accordance with the various formulas prescribed in the act. The amount of these expenditures is determined by the number of people who received assistance and the average monthly payments made to or on behalf of these people. The Federal contributions to the States for public assistance are mandatory and admit of no administrative discretion. Therefore, the committee has included the full amount requested.

Special Institutions

GALLAUDET COLLEGE, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1966 appropriation to date	$2, 277, 000
Supplemental estimate	24, 000
House allowance	24, 000
Committee recommendation	24, 000

The committee recommends approval of the House allowance and supplemental estimate of $24,000 to provide for salary increases comparable to those granted Federal employees under Public Law

89–301. Congress has appropriated funds for similar purposes in past years for nonteaching staff to bring the college employees' salaries on a par with Federal employees.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1966 appropriation to date	$10,982,000
Supplemental estimate	216,000
House allowance	216,000
Committee recommendation	216,000

The committee recommends approval of the House allowance and supplemental estimate of $216,000 to provide for salary increases comparable to those granted Federal employees under Public Law 89–301 and social security premium rates in line with changes under Public Law 89–97. As is indicated under the item next above, Congress has in the past provided for similar increases over the past several years to both of these institutions.

Office of the Secretary

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1966 appropriation to date	$3,350,000
Supplemental estimate	95,000
House allowance	66,000
Committee recommendation	66,000

The committee recommends the House allowance of $66,000 which is a reduction of $29,000 from the supplemental estimate.

The estimate contemplated $36,000 for increased pay costs which is approved, and $59,000 and 12 positions to expand the staff of the State merit system because of increased workload resulting from newly enacted legislation. The committee approves the House allowance of $30,000 and 6 positions for this latter purpose.

Railroad Retirement Board

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1966 appropriation to date	$10,650,000
Supplemental estimate	1,075,000
House allowance	1,075,000
Committee recommendation	1,075,000

The committee recommends $1,075,000 which is the amount of the supplemental request and the House allowance.

Of the amount approved, $225,000 is for increased pay costs and $850,000 is for increased workload resulting from the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 which made major changes in the old-age and survivors and disability insurance programs, which required the Railroad Retirement Board to make adjustments in its benefit rates in order to restore the relationship in benefits under these systems as required by law. The amendments also require the Board's participation in the administration of the new programs of hospital and medical insurance benefits.

These funds are derived from the railroad retirement account financed jointly by employee-employer taxes.

CHAPTER VII

LEGISLATIVE

Senate

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Supplemental request	$200,000
Committee recommendation	200,000

The committee has included $200,000 in the bill for "Inquiries and investigations." This will provide a total of $5,094,255 for this purpose for fiscal year 1966. The estimated balance in this account April 1, 1966, is $1,253,026 and the estimated obligations from April 1, 1966, to June 30, 1966, are $1,452,358, with a resultant deficiency in excess of $199,000.

The committee was advised that the budget estimate for "Inquiries and investigations" for fiscal year 1967 is in the amount of $4,933,210 and that this figure is totally unrealistic in view of the authorizations which have been approved by the Senate.

In view of these facts, the Financial Clerk of the Senate is directed to submit the necessary documents to the Bureau of the Budget to increase this budget estimate to $5,300,000.

Architect of the Capitol

CAPITOL GROUNDS

Supplemental estimate	$17,000
House allowance	17,000
Committee recommendation	17,000

The committee concurs in the House action and recommends a supplemental appropriation of $17,000 for "Capitol Grounds." These funds are required to cover expenses for the emergency removal of snow.

CHAPTER VIII

PUBLIC WORKS

Department of Defense—Civil

Department of the Army

Corps of Engineers—Civil

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

1966 appropriations to date	$183, 112, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	7, 350, 000
House allowance	7, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	7, 350, 000

The committee recommends $7,350,000, the budget estimate and $350,000 above the amount allowed by the House. The amount recommended includes $4,230,000 for repair and restoration of navigation facilities damaged by Hurricane Betsy; $920,000 for salary increases as authorized by Public Law 89–301 and Public Law 89–132; and $2,200,000 for the cost of wage board rate increases effective during the period October 1, 1964, through June 30, 1966.

The committee has been advised that a portion of the authorized Jacksonville Harbor project, designated as the old channel of the St. Johns River, has not been maintained at project depths. Recently the city of Jacksonville has constructed a new powerplant on property adjacent to this portion of the authorized project. Restoration of channel dimensions in this section of the authorized project is required for the delivery of fuel for this plant and other planned industrial expansion in this area which would be served by this channel. The new powerplant with an initial installed capacity of 300,000 kw. is scheduled to be placed in operation early next month. Plans for future expansion contemplate an ultimate capacity of 1½ to 2 kilowatts.

The committee desires that the corps immediately initiate the necessary dredging to restore project dimensions in the old channel of the St. Johns River out of available operation and maintenance funds.

FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE, AND SHORE PROTECTION EMERGENCIES

1966 appropriations to date	$12, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	7, 750, 000
House allowance	7, 750, 000
Committee recommendation	7, 750, 000

The committee recommends $7,750,300, the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House. The amount recommended includes $4,235,000 to cover the cost of emergency activities associated with Hurricane Betsy, and $3,515,000 is provided to meet additional emergency requirements likely to occur during the balance of this fiscal year.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government

OPERATING EXPENSES

1966 appropriations to date	$31, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	404, 000
House allowance	300, 000
Committee recommendation	300, 000

The committee recommends $300,000, the amount allowed by the House, and $104,000 below the budget estimate. The funds recommended are required to meet increased pay and associated costs authorized by Public Law 89–301, and for overtime compensation for police and firemen resulting from enactment of Public Law 89–282. The Panama Canal Company has informed the committee that by rigorous economy the House reduction in the budget request can be absorbed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

1966 appropriations to date	$48, 011, 500
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 88) (*by transfer*)	(3, 600, 000)
House allowance	[1]
Committee recommendation	(1, 400, 000)

[1] Not considered by the House.

The committee recommends language authorizing the transfer of $1,400,000 for construction on this project. Testimony indicates that presently available funds will be exhausted by mid-May. The amount recommended herein will be sufficient to carry work through fiscal 1966.

The committee language follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For an additional amount for "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund", $1,400,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Loan Program", Bureau of Reclamation.

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

1966 appropriations to date	$1, 700, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	520, 000
House allowance	520, 000
Committee recommendation	520, 000

The committee recommendation for this item is $520,000, the amount of the House allowance and the supplemental request, which will provide the funds necessary to assure the timely completion of the Jonesboro-Idalia transmission line in southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas.

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc 383)	$500,000
House allowance	450,000
Committee recomendation	450,000

The committee agrees to the House allowance of $450,000, a reduction of $50,000 from the budget request for additional funds to cover unanticipated emergencies arising in the conduct of foreign affairs in fiscal year 1966.

PAYMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$45,000
House allowance	45,000
Committee recommendation	45,000

The committee agrees to the House allowance of the budget request, $45,000, to finance certain changes made by the Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–308) of annuities for personnel who retired before October 1960. The sum allowed covers the added costs for 4 months of the current fiscal year, 1966.

International Commissions

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$32,000
House allowance	0
Committee recommendation	0

The committee concurs with the House disapproval of the $32,000 request for funds for preparation of claims of American citizens against Canada for damages caused in 1951–52 by high waters to property along the south shore of Lake Ontario. Expenses for this project should continue to be funded from the regular appropriation for "Salaries and expenses" and this appropriation.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	(1)
House allowance	(1)
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 88)	($200,000)
Committee recommendation	[1](200,000)

[1] Language increasing limitation by $25,000.

The committee has approved the full budget request for an additional $200,000, to be derived by transfer of funds from the appropriation for Salaries and expenses, General legal activities, fiscal year 1966; also, the House allowance to increase by $25,000 (from $375,000 to $400,000) the 1966 limitation on expenses for expert witnesses. The additional $200,000 is necessary to cover the increased cost of witnesses who appear on behalf of the Government in cases to which the United States is a party.

Federal Prison System

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$500,000
House allowance	475,000
Committee recommendation	475,000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of $475,000, a reduction of $25,000 from the budget request, to cover the increased costs for maintaining Federal prisoners in non-Federal institutions for the balance of fiscal year 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent Office

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $1,000,000 to provide $605,000 for increased pay costs authorized by Public Law 89–301, and $395,000 for expenses relating to the printing of 5,000 additional patents for issuance under the acceleration provisions of Public Law 89–83.

1967 Alaska Centennial

Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	$4,600,000
Committee recommendation	4,600,000

The committee recommends the appropriation of $4,600,000, the budget request, to provide for United States participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the Alaska Purchase, as authorized by Public Law 89–375, approved March 26, 1966. The sum, to remain available until June 30, 1968, will allow not to exceed $4,000,000 of grants to the State of Alaska for projects to initially support the 1967 Alaska Centennial as an event of historical interest, and not to exceed $600,000 for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the Centennial celebration.

Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center

Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 85)	$160,000
Committee recommendation	160,000

The committee approves the supplemental request of $160,000 for expenses of conducting a study and compiling a report on the nature, extent, and cost of United States participation in the proposed Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Florida, and the nature and extent of participation of foreign countries (particularly

Latin American countries) and private industries. Public Law 89–355, approved February 19, 1966, authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $250,000 for the report to Congress not later than May 15, 1966.

THE JUDICIARY

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services

SALARIES OF JUDGES

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$220,000
House allowance	200,000
Committee recommendation	200,000

The committee agrees to the House allowance of $200,000, a reduction of $20,000 from the budget request, for additional funds for the compensation, including related benefits, of Circuit and District Judges, this fiscal year 1966.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$1,165,000
House allowance	1,165,000
Committee recommendation	1,165,000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of the full budget estimate requested to cover increases in the attendance fee and subsistence allowance of jurors from $7 to $10, as authorized by Public Law 89–165, approved September 2, 1965.

RELATED AGENCIES

Commission on Civil Rights

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$468,000
House allowance	425,000
Committee recommendation	425,000

The committee agrees with the House recommendation of $425,000, a reduction of $43,000 from the supplemental request. The allowance will provide $399,000 for initiation of a study of the problems of race and education as requested by the President in November 1965, and for completion by the end of this calendar year, and $26,000 for increased pay and related costs as authorized by Public Law 89–301.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$4,250,000
House allowance	3,000,000
Committee recommendation	3,000,000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of $3,000,000, a reduction of $250,000 from the request for additional funds to carry out the civil rights educational activities administered by the Office of

Education. Principal activities authorized under title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and funded by this appropriation include: Grants to local school boards, grants to State departments, area training centers, Institutes, and administration of the program.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 383)	$742,000
House allowance	500,000
Committee recommendation	500,000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of $500,000, a reduction of $24,000 from the request for additional funds to finance expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission this fiscal year 1966. The allowance will provide $52,000 for increased pay costs authorized by Public Law 89–301, and $448,000 to accelerate processing of the complaint workload increase, and to begin implementation of the affirmative action program designed to achieve voluntary compliance with the Civil Rights Act.

CHAPTER X

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

OPERATIONS

1966 appropriation	$4,304,900,000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 383)	271,904,000
Supplemental request (S. Doc. 88)	25,000,000
House allowance	269,904,000
Committee recommendation	294,904,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $294,904,000, which is an increase of $25 million over the amount allowed by the House. The committee concurs in the recommendation of the House of $269,904,000 with respect to the original estimate submitted (H. Doc. 383), which requested $271,904,000 in supplemental funds. Subsequent to consideration by the House of Representatives, however, a revised estimate was submitted to the Senate (S. Doc. 88), in which $25 million additional was requested. These funds are necessary due to the continuing high level of mail volume. The rate of increase for the period ending February 25 was up 5.8 percent over the same period last year, and it is obvious that funds must be provided to cover the costs of handling this volume of mail for the remainder of the fiscal year. The funds provided to date plus the funds recommended herein now total $4,599,804,000.

TRANSPORTATION

1966 appropriation	$595,000,000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 383)	21,000,000
House allowance	21,000,000
Committee recommendation	21,000,000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of $21,000,000, the amount requested, to finance the costs of transporting the substantially increased volume of mail. The 1966 regular appropriation of $595,000,000 plus the amount of $21 million recommended herein total $616,000,000.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

1966 appropriation	$105,000,000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 383)	3,106,000
House allowance	3,106,000
Committee recommendation	3,106,000

For "Plant and equipment," the committee recommends the sum of $3,106,000, the amount of the request and the House allowance. These funds will provide for the accelerated procurement and installation of mechanized mail handling equipment. The 1966 regular appropriation of $105,000,000 for activities under this head plus the sum of $3,106,000 recommended herein total $108,106,000.

CHAPTER XI

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

The committee recommends an appropriation of $10,828,683 for this item. This sum consists of $3,954,787 for claims and $6,873,896 for judgments rendered against the United States. An enumeration of the items comprising the aggregate of claims and judgments may be found in House Document 414 and Senate Document 87.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

The committee recommends appropriations of $959,813,620 for increased pay costs in title II of the bill. This sum represents a net decrease of $3,307,150 under the amount allowed by the House.

The reductions made by the committee consist of decreases of $2,558,000 in items of the Department of Commerce and $1,500,000 in the Federal Aviation Agency, and an increase of $750,850 for Senate items. The addition of this latter amount was necessary because Senate items are customarily omitted from the House bill. The budget estimate for increased Senate pay costs aggregated $850,850, thus the committee allowance is $100,000 below the estimate.

As previously indicated, title II of the bill deals exclusively with additional funds required to meet increased pay costs, both military and civilian, authorized by or pursuant to law in all three branches of the Government. An additional sum for these same purposes, totaling $208,664,500, is included in the various appropriations of title I of this act. This total is $350,000 more than the amount in the House bill.

The estimated pay increase costs, the proposed absorptions, the budget estimates, and the House and Senate committee figures are shown on the following table (which includes titles I and II):

[Dollars in millions, rounded]

	Total estimated costs	Absorption proposed		Budget requests for added funds	Passed House	Committee recommendation
		Amount	Percent			
Military pay (Public Law 89–132)	$870.1	$96.0	11	$774.1	$774.1	$774.1
Civilian pay (Public Law 89–301): Wage board employees and other administrative actions pursuant to law	600.2	194.1	32	406.1	397.3	394.4
Total	1,470.3	290.1	20	1,180.2	1,171.4	1,168.5

OVERSEAS DEPENDENTS SCHOOL TEACHERS SALARY INCREASES

Public Law 89–391 provides for mandatory salary increases for teachers in the Department of Defense overseas dependents schools. Section 606 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act,1966, imposes a limitation on the total funds available for the operation of these schools based on a per pupil limitation of $455. The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to increase this limitation to the extent necessary to meet these increased salaries.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE I					
	CHAPTER I					
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
	FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION					
S. 85	Emergency credit revolving fund	$30,000,000		$30,000,000		+$30,000,000
	CHAPTER II					
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
383	Federal payment to District of Columbia	2,300,000	$1,250,000	1,250,000	−$1,050,000	
	(District of Columbia funds)					
383	Public safety	(1,249,200)	(1,249,200)	(1,249,200)		
383	Parks and recreation	(210,600)	(210,600)	(210,600)		
	Total, chapter II	2,300,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	−1,050,000	
	CHAPTER III					
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS					
S. 85	Asian Development Bank	140,000,000		140,000,000		+140,000,000
	CHAPTER IV					
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
	NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY					
S. 85	Operation and maintenance of properties	12,000		12,000		+12,000

	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
380	Salaries and expenses	12,681,000	10,180,000	12,681,000		+2,501,000
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION					
S. 85	General operating expenses	3,000,000		3,000,000		+3,000,000
383	Compensation and pensions	288,000,000	288,000,000	288,000,000		
383	Readjustment benefits	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000		
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
383	Disaster relief	75,000,000	45,000,000	75,000,000		+30,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
380	Rent supplement program:					
	Annual contract authorization for grants	(30,000,000)	(12,000,000)		(−30,000,000)	(−12,000,000)
	Appropriation for rent payments		100,000			−100,000
	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD					
S. 85	Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	Language				
	Total, chapter IV	383,693,000	348,280,000	383,693,000		+35,413,000
	CHAPTER V					
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
383	Management of lands and resources	1,495,000	1,495,000	1,495,000		
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
383	Resources management	755,000	755,000	755,000		
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
383	Management and protection	1,307,000	1,028,000	1,245,000	−62,000	+217,000
383	Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	924,000	827,000	892,000	−32,000	+65,000
383, S. 85	Construction	1,711,000	900,000	1,711,000		+811,000
383	Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000		

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER V—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
	OFFICE OF TERRITORIES					
S. 85	Administration of territories	$2,500,000		$2,500,000		+$2,500,000
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES					
383	Management and investigations of resources	203,000	$148,000	193,000	−$10,000	+45,000
	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE					
383	Management and investigations of resources	763,000	658,000	712,700	−50,300	+54,700
	Total, Department of the Interior	15,158,000	11,311,000	15,003,700	−154,300	+3,692,700
	RELATED AGENCIES					
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
	FOREST SERVICE					
	Forest protection and utilization:					
383	Forest land management	9,635,000	9,635,000	9,635,000		
383	Forest research	610,000	610,000	610,000		
383	State and private forestry cooperation	45,000	45,000	45,000		
	FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW					
S. 85	Salaries and expenses	29,000		18,000	−11,000	+18,000

	NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
383	Salaries and expenses	68,000	18,000	68,000		+50,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
383	Transitional grants to Alaska	876,000	876,000	876,000		
	Total, related agencies	11,263,000	11,184,000	11,252,000	−11,000	+68,000
	Total, chapter V	26,421,000	22,495,000	26,255,700	−165,360	+3,760,700
	CHAPTER VI					
	DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY					
383	Trade adjustment activities (by transfer)	(10,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(−9,000,000)	
383	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(1,043,000)	(1,028,000)	(1,028,000)	(−15,000)	
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS					
383	Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(614,000)	(614,000)	(614,000)		
	Total, Department of Labor	(11,657,000)	(2,642,000)	(2,642,000)	(−9,015,000)	
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
383	Expansion and improvement of vocational education	950,000	950,000	950,000		
383	Vocational student loan insurance fund	50,000	50,000	50,000		
383	Elementary and secondary educational activities	184,000,000	184,000,000	184,000,000		
383	Higher educational activities	11,000,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	+300,000	
380	National Teacher Corps	13,200,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	−3,700,000	−500,000
----------	Payments to school districts		41,000,000	41,000,000	+41,000,000	
	VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION					
383	Grants to States	39,000,000	39,000,000	39,000,000		

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER VI—Continued					
	DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE—Continued					
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
383	National Library of Medicine	$4,175,000	$4,175,000	$4,175,000		
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
383	Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged	367,800,000	125,800,000	125,800,000	−$242,000,000	
383	Payment for military service credits	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000		
	WELFARE ADMINISTRATION					
383	Grants to States for public assistance	381,000,000	381,000,000	381,000,000		
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS					
383	Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses	24,000	24,000	24,000		
383	Howard University, salaries and expenses	216,000	216,000	216,000		
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
383	Office of Field Administration, salaries and expenses	27,000	13,000	13,000	−14,000	
	By transfer	(68,000)	(53,000)	(53,000)	−(15,000)	
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	902,028,000	−204,414,000	−$500,000

	RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD					
383	Limitation on salaries and expenses (increase)	(1,075,000)	(1,075,000)	(1,075,000)		
	Total, chapter VI	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	902,028,000	−204,414,000	−500,000
	CHAPTER VII					
	LEGISLATIVE					
	SENATE					
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE					
	Inquiries and investigations			200,000	+200,000	+200,000
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
	Gratuities to widows of deceased Members		90,000	90,000	+90,000	
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS					
415	Capitol Grounds	17,000	17,000	17,000		
	Total, chapter VII		107,000	307,000	+290,000	+200,000
	CHAPTER VIII					
	PUBLIC WORKS					
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
	Corps of Engineers—Civil					
383	Operation and maintenance, general	7,350,000	7,000,000	7,350,000		+350,000
383	Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies	7,750,000	7,750,000	7,750,000		
	Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil	15,100,000	14,750,000	15,100,000		+350,000
	THE PANAMA CANAL					
	CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT					
383	Operating expenses	404,000	300,000	300,000	−104,000	

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER VIII—Continued					
	PUBLIC WORKS—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION					
S. 88	Upper Colorado River storage project (by transfer)	*($3,600,000)*		($1,400,000)	(−$2,200,000)	
	SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
383	Construction	520,000	$520,000	520,000		
	Total, Department of the Interior	520,000	520,000	520,000		
	Total, chapter VIII	16,024,000	15,570,000	15,920,000	−104,000	+$350,000
	CHAPTER IX					
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS					
383	Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	500,000	450,000	450,000	−50,000	
383	Payment to foreign service retirement and disability fund	45,000	45,000	45,000		
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS					
383	American sections, international commissions	32,000			−32,000	
	Total, Department of State	577,000	495,000	495,000	−82,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
383, S. 88	Fees and expenses of witnesses (by transfer)	*(200,000)*	Language	*(200,000)*		+*(200,000)*

	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM					
383	Support of U.S. prisoners	500,000	475,000	475,000	−25,000	
	Total, Department of Justice	500,000	475,000	475,000	−25,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
S. 85	1967 Alaska Centennial	4,600,000		4,600,000		+4,600,000
	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
S. 85	Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center	160,000		160,000		+160,000
	PATENT OFFICE					
383	Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
	Total, Department of Commerce	5,760,000	1,000,000	5,760,000		+4,760,000
	THE JUDICIARY					
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES					
383	Salaries of judges	220,000	200,000	200,000	−20,000	
383	Fees of jurors and commissioners	1,165,000	1,165,000	1,165,000		
	Total, the judiciary	1,385,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	−20,000	
	RELATED AGENCIES					
	COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS					
383	Salaries and expenses	468,000	425,000	425,000	−43,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
383	Civil rights educational activities	3,250,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−250,000	
	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION					
383	Salaries and expenses	742,000	500,000	500,000	−242,000	
	Total, chapter IX	12,682,000	7,260,000	12,020,000	−662,000	+4,760,000

Comparative statement of budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER X					
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT					
	(Out of the postal fund)					
383, S. 88	Operations	$296,904,000	$269,904,000	$294,904,000	−$2,000,000	+$25,000,000
383	Transportation	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000		
383	Plant and equipment	3,106,000	3,106,000	3,106,000		
	Total, chapter X	321,010,000	294,010,000	319,010,000	−2,000,000	+25,000,000
	CHAPTER XI					
	CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS					
414, S. 87	Claims and judgments	10,828,683	10,251,798	10,828,683		+576,885
	Total, title I	2,049,417,683	1,601,751,798	1,841,312,383	−208,105,300	+239,560,585
	TITLE II					
	INCREASED PAY COSTS					
405	Increased pay costs	971,393,220	963,120,770	959,813,620	−11,579,600	−3,307,150
	Grand total	3,020,810,903	2,564,872,568	2,801,126,003	−219,684,900	+236,253,435

○

Calendar No. 1103

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14012

[Report No. 1137]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 1, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

APRIL 25, 1966

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 12, 1965, by Mr. PASTORE, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second

Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund," $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER ~~I~~ *II*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" for the general fund, $1,250,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including $3,700 for disbursement by the administrative office of the United States courts for expenses of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, $1,249,200, of which $111,600 shall be payable from the highway fund, $200 from the water fund, and $200 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", $210,600.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year involved.

CHAPTER III

FOREIGN OPERATIONS FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Asian Development Bank

For subscriptions to the Asian Development Bank, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, to remain available until expended, $140,000,000, of which $20,000,000 shall be available for the first installment on paid-in capital stock, $20,000,000 shall be available for the second installment on such stock, and $100,000,000 shall be available for the entire subscription to callable capital stock.

CHAPTER ~~H~~ *IV*

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Operation and Maintenance of Properties

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance of properties", $12,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", ~~$10,180,000~~ *$12,681,000*.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", $3,000,000.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", $288,000,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", including not to exceed $75,000 for the purposes of section 5 of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–41), ~~$45,000,000~~ *$75,000,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

~~DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT~~

~~OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY~~

~~RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM~~

~~For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $100,000: *Provided,* That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.~~

CHAPTER ~~III~~ *V*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $1,495,000.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", $755,000.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", ~~$1,028,000~~ *$1,245,000*.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", ~~$827,000~~ *$892,000*.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", ~~$900,000~~ *$1,711,000*, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)", $5,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Office of Territories

administration of territories

For an additional amount of "Administration of Territories", $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

management and investigations of resources

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", ~~$148,000~~ *$193,000.*

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

management and investigations of resources

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", ~~$658,000~~ *$712,700.*

RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

forest service

forest protection and utilization

For additional amounts for "Forest protection and utilization", as follows:

"Forest land management", $9,635,000;

"Forest research", $610,000; and

"State and private forestry cooperation", $45,000.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $18,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", ~~$18,000~~ *$68,000.*

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For an additional amount for "Transitional grants to Alaska", $876,000.

CHAPTER ~~IV~~ *VI*

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses of worker adjustment assistance allowances and for administration of adjustment assistance services to workers as provided in Title III of the Trade

Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794), and Title III of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–283), $1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses," $1,028,000, of which $821,900 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" and $206,100 may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", $614,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Expansion and improvement of vocational education", for advances for reserve funds and interest payments on insured loans under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, $950,000, *of which $100,000 for interest payments shall remain available until expended and $850,000 for advances shall remain available until June 30, 1968.*

VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

For the vocational student loan insurance fund created by section 13 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (70 Stat. 1046), $50,000, to remain available until expended.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Elementary and secondary educational activities", for meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children under title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended. $184,000,000, *to be available from March 1, 1966, and*

all obligations incurred during the period from such date to the date of enactment of this Act, are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the authorization for the purpose: Provided, That in addition whenever the Commissioner of Education shall have approved an application for a project in accordance with said title II subject to the amount of entitlements available to the States for such purpose, the cost of such project shall constitute a contractual obligtaion of the Federal Government.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher Educational Activities", $11,300,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for basic grants authorized in section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $1,000,000 shall be for training grants under section 223 of that Act, and $300,000 shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials under part C of title II of that Act.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

For the National Teacher Corps authorized in part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, ~~$10,000,000~~ *$9,500,000*: *Provided,* That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of

any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: *Provided further,* That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts", $41,000,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES

For an additional amount for "Grants to States", for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, $39,000,000.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount for "National Library of Medicine", including carrying out the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1059), $4,175,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1967.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENT TO TRUST FUNDS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance trust funds, as authorized by sections 103 and 111 (d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and section 1844 of the Social Security Act, $125,800,000, of which $100,000,000 shall remain available through December 31, 1967, as authorized by section 1844.

PAYMENT FOR MILITARY SERVICE CREDITS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the Federal Disability Insurance, and the Federal Hospital Insurance trust funds, for benefit payments and other costs resulting from noncontributory coverage extended certain veterans as provided under section 217 (g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, $105,000,000.

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance", $381,000,000.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

GALLAUDET COLLEGE, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", $24,000.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Howard University, salaries and expenses", $216,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration", $13,000, together with not to exceed $53,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", $1,075,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

CHAPTER ~~V~~ *VII*

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and Investigations", $200,000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Eva Hassell Bonner, widow of Herbert C. Bonner, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, $30,000.

For payment to Lera Millard Thomas, widow of Albert Thomas, late a Representative from the State of Texas, $30,000.

For payment to Mary I. Baldwin, widow of John F. Baldwin, late a Representative from the State of California $30,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For an additional amount for "Capitol grounds", $17,000.

CHAPTER ~~VI~~ *VIII*

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", ~~$7,000,000~~ *$7,350,000*, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION

EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies", $7,750,000, to remain available until expended.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", $300,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $520,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For an additional amount for "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund", $1,400,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Loan Program", Bureau of Reclamation.

CHAPTER ~~VII~~ *IX*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service", $450,000.

PAYMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, $45,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

~~In addition to the amount heretofore made available in the appropriation under this head for the current fiscal year for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), not to exceed $25,000 shall be available in such appropriation for such compensation and expenses.~~

For an additional amount for "Fees and Expenses", including not to exceed $25,000 for compensation and expenses

of witnesses (including expert witnesses), $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", fiscal year 1966.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", $475,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PATENT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $1,000,000.

1967 ALASKA CENTENNIAL

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Alaska Centennial Act of 1966, including administrative expenses, to remain available until June 30, 1968, $4,600,000, of which not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for grants to the State of Alaska, and not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for appropriate participation by

the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the Centennial celebration.

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center

For expenses necessary to conduct the studies and submit the reports, and for related expenses, required by section 2(b) of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89-355), as to the proposed participation by the United States, by foreign countries, and industry in Interama, $160,000, to remain available until expended.

THE JUDICIARY

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", $200,000.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and commissioners", $1,165,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $425,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Civil rights educational activities," including not to exceed $225,000 for salaries and expenses, $3,000,000.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $500,000.

CHAPTER ~~VIII~~ *X*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Operations", ~~$269,904,000~~ *$294,904,000*.

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for "Transportation", $21,000,000.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", $3,106,000.

CHAPTER ~~IX~~ *XI*

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in *Senate Document Numbered 87 and* House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-ninth Congress, ~~$10,251,798~~ *$10,828,683*, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in said judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate:

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators", $8,065;

"Salaries, officers and employees", $543,105;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", $7,425;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Senate policy committees", $9,940;

"Automobiles and maintenance", $840;

"Inquiries and investigations", $116,865, including $3,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;

"Folding documents", $945;

"Miscellaneous items", $32,065, including $16,200 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol

in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87–82, approved July 6, 1961;

Joint Items:

"Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures", $945, to remain available until expended;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Joint Economic Committee", $9,000;

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", $8,250;

"Joint Committee on Printing", $3,750;

Contingent expenses of the House:

"Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation", $10,530;

"Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy", $655;

"Joint Committee on Defense Production", $2,160;

House:

"Compensation of Members", $7,500:

"Office of the Speaker", $3,155:

"Office of the Parliamentarian", $2,755:

"Compilation of Precedents", $270;

"Office of the Chaplain", $410;

"Office of the Clerk", $41,230;

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms", $28,205;

"Office of the Doorkeeper", $43,745;

"Office of the Postmaster", $13,825;

"Committee employees", $103,000;

"Six minority employees", $3,175;

"Majority floor leader", $2,340;

"Minority floor leader", $1,940;

"Majority whip", $1,565;

"Minority whip", $1,565;

"Printing clerks", $430;

"Technical assistant to attending physician", $385;

"Official reporters of debates", $6,880;

"Official reporters to committees", $6,940;

"Legislative counsel", $7,970;

"Members' clerk hire", $770,000;

"Special and select committees", $100,000;

"Coordinator of information", $3,675;

"Revision of the laws", $730;

"Speaker's auto", $330;

"Majority leader's auto", $330;

"Minority leader's auto", $330;

"Miscellaneous items", $19,000, for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812):

Architect of the Capitol:

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", $13,900;

Capitol buildings and grounds:

"Capitol buildings", $40,000;

"Capitol grounds", $10,000;

"Senate office buildings", $31,000;

"Senate garage", $600;

"Capitol power plant", $10,000;

"Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care", $13,000;

Botanic Garden: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000;

Library of Congress:

"Salaries and expenses", $256,700;

Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", $51,500:

Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", $62,200;

Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses", $65,300;

Books for the Blind: "Salaries and expenses", $6,600;

"Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)", $3,600;

Government Printing Office:

Office of Superintendent of Documents:

"Salaries and expenses": Not to exceed $65,000 of the reserve fund under this head for the current fiscal year may be used for increased pay costs authorized by law.

THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States:

"Salaries", $41,000;

"Care of Buildings and Grounds", $5,000;

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Customs Court: "Salaries and expenses", $19,000;

Court of Claims: "Salaries and expenses", $13,300;

Court of appeals; district courts, and other judicial services:

"Salaries of supporting personnel", $818,000;

"Administrative Office of the United States Courts", $31,000;

"Expenses of referees", $125,000, to be derived from the "Referees' salary and expense fund".

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The White House Office:

"Salaries and expenses", $85,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Special projects", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of the Budget: "Salaries and expenses", $131,000;

Council of Economic Advisers: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000;

National Security Council: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000;

Office of Emergency Planning: "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies", $86,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", fiscal year 1966;

Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic assistance:

"Administrative expenses", Agency for Inter-

national Development, $980,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966;

"Administrative and other expenses", Department of State, $42,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance". fiscal year 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service:

"Salaries and expenses", as follows:

"Research", $2,402,500; and

"Plant and animal disease and pest control". $1,268,500;

Cooperative State Research Service: "Payments and expenses", $32,000;

Extension Service: "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses": Of the amount made available under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, for "Payment to States and Puerto Rico", $64,000 shall be transferred to the subappropriation for "Federal Extension Service";

Farmer Cooperative Service: "Salaries and expenses". $26,000;

Soil Conservation Service:

"Conservation operations", $2,608,000;

"Watershed planning", $140,000, to remain available until expended;

"Watershed protection", $585,000, to remain available until expended;

"Flood prevention", $160,000, to remain available until expended;

"Great Plains conservation program", $82,000, to remain available until expended;

"Resource conservation and development", $46,000, to remain available until expended;

Economic Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", $246,000;

Statistical Reporting Service: "Salaries and expenses", $250,000;

Consumer and Marketing Service: "Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", $1,905,000;

Foreign Agricultural Service: "Salaries and expenses", $178,000;

Commodity Exchange Authority: "Salaries and expenses", $28,000;

Rural Electrification Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $268,000;

Farmers Home Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: "Administrative and operating expenses", $202,000;

Rural Community Development Service: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

Office of the Inspector General: "Salaries and expenses", $145,000;

Office of the General Counsel: "Salaries and expenses", $102,000;

Office of Information: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

National Agricultural Library: "Salaries and expenses", $36,000;

Office of Management Services: "Salaries and expenses", $59,000;

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000;

Forest Service: "Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)", $964,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $89,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for*

"Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

Office of Business Economics: "Salaries and expenses", $50,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

Bureau of the Census:

"Salaries and expenses", $320,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", fiscal year 1966*;

"1964 Census of Agriculture", $110,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967, *to be derived from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", fiscal year 1966*;

Business and Defense Services Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $125,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

International Activities:

"Salaries and expenses", $160,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,* of which $23,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1967:

"Export control", $100,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", fiscal year 1966,* of which $33,400 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs;

Office of Field Services: "Salaries and expenses", $90,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

Coast and Geodetic Survey: "Salaries and expenses", $510,000;

National Bureau of Standards: "Research and technical services", $500,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

Weather Bureau:

"Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000 *of which $754,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statitstics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

"Research and development", $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968;

"Meteorological satellite operations", $48,000, to remain available until expended;

Maritime Administration:

"Salaries and expenses", $222,000 *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,* of which $200,000 is for administrative expenses and $22,000 is for reserve fleet expenses;

"Maritime training", $38,000;

Bureau of Public Roads: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $950,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administration and research).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Military personnel:

"Military personnel, Army", $222,100,000;

"Military personnel, Navy", $182,600,000;

"Military personnel, Marine Corps", $42,400,000;

"Military personnel, Air Force", $227,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Navy", $4,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", $1,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Air Force", $1,200,000;

"National Guard personnel, Army", $4,500,000;

"National Guard personnel, Air Force", $3,500,000;

"Retired pay, Defense", $71,000,000;

Operation and maintenance:

"Operation and maintenance, Army", $33,400,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Navy", $23,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", $1,054,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air Force", $27,600,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", $14,356,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", $2,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard", $1,000,000;

"Court of Military Appeals, Defense", $11,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The limitation contained in section 606 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1966 on the funds available for the operation of overseas dependents schools is hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by Public Law 89-391.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army:

Cemeterial expenses: "Salaries and expenses", $67,000;

Corps of Engineers—Civil: "General expenses", $385,000;

Ryukyu Islands, Army: "Administration", $40,000;

The Panama Canal:

Panama Canal Company: "Limitation on general and administrative expenses" (increase of $137,000 in the limitation on the amount available for general and administrative expenses);

United States Soldiers' Home: "Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay" (increase of $146,000 in the amount available for maintenance and operation to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service:

"Hospitals and medical care", $770,000;

"Foreign quarantine activities", $212,000;

"Indian health activities", $1,355,000;

Saint Elizabeths Hospital: "Salaries and expenses", the total amount available for "Salaries and expenses" in the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966", is hereby increased from $29,886,000 to $30,613,000;

Social Security Administration: "Limitation on salaries and expenses, Social Security Administration" (increase of $8,037,000 in the amount to be expended, as authorized by section 201 (g) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein);

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $18,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund;

"Surplus property utilization", $20,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Federal Housing Administration: "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration" ~~(increases of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses)~~ *(increase of $575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses)*; administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses);

Public Housing Administration:

"Administrative expenses", $405,000;

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative

expenses, Public Housing Administration" (increase of $405,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses).

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs:

"Education and welfare services", $1,202,400;

"General administrative expenses", $103,000;

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Office of Territories: "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands", $102,600;

Mineral Resources:

Geological Survey: "Surveys, investigations, and research", $1,510,000;

Bureau of Mines:

"Conservation and development of mineral resources", $500,000;

"Health and safety", $92,000;

"General administrative expenses", $22,000;

Office of Oil and Gas: "Salaries and expenses", $16,300;

Fish and Wildlife Service:

Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: "Salaries and expenses", $8,500;

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

"Management and investigation of resources", $86,800, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development", fiscal year 1966;

"General administrative expenses", $15,000:

"Administration of Pribilof Islands", $10,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: "General administrative expenses", $34,300;

National Park Service: "General administrative expenses", $57,000;

Bureau of Reclamation: "General administrative expenses", $241,200, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operation and maintenance", fiscal year 1966:

Bonneville Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $173,000;

Southwestern Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $25,300;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $109,800;

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $105,000;

Office of Water Resources Research: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration:

Alien property activities: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $7,000 in the amount for general administrative expenses);

"Salaries and expenses, antitrust division", $45,000;

"Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", $647,000;

Federal Bureau of Investigation: "Salaries and expenses", $3,735,000;

Immigration and Naturalization Service: "Salaries and expenses", $1,782,000;

Federal Prison System: "Salaries and expenses", $1,035,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration:

Office of Manpower Administrator: "Salaries and expenses", $66,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Manpower development and training activities", $25,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training: "Salaries and expenses", $87,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Wage and Labor Standards:

Bureau of Labor Standards: "Salaries and expenses", $39,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Women's Bureau: "Salaries and expenses", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Employees' Compensation: "Salaries and expenses", $58,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $1,550 to be derived

from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 944);

Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Salaries and expenses", $242,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of International Labor Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," fiscal year 1966;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $3,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, unemployment trust fund;

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $35,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Federal contract compliance program", $7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Un-

employment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

"Administration and regional operation", $1,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,760,000, of which $1,299,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966, and $123,600 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Extension and remodeling, State Department Building";

International organizations and conferences: "Missions to international organizations", $59,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966;

International commissions:

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: "Salaries and expenses", $17,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $138,000;

Bureau of Customs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,043,000;

Bureau of Narcotics: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

Bureau of the Public Debt: "Administering the public debt", $360,000;

Coast Guard:

"Operating expenses", $9,400,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966;

"Retired pay", $1,000,000;

"Reserve training", $1,050,000;

Internal Revenue Service:

"Salaries and expenses", $381,000;

"Revenue accounting and processing", $3,472,000;

"Compliance", $9,305,000:

Office of the Treasurer: "Salaries and expenses",

$60,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

United States Secret Service: "Salaries and expenses, guard force", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, United States Secret Service", fiscal year 1966.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

"Operations", ~~$9,500,000~~ *$8,000,000*;

"Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport", $54,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport", $62,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", $4,600,000;

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service", $861,000, of which $55,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966;

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", $336,000;

"Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service", $135,000, of which $45,000 shall be derived

by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966, and $90,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966;

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", $33,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"General operating expenses", $1,000,000;

"Medical and prosthetic research", $365,000;

"Medical care", $17,456,000.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Civil Aeronautics Board: "Salaries and expenses", $240,000;

Civil Service Commission:

"Salaries and expenses", $528,000, and in addition $15,000 may be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations";

"Limitation on administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund" (increase of $6,200 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Farm Credit Administration: "Limitation on administrative expenses" (increase of $28,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: "Salaries and expenses", $1,500;

Federal Communications Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $346,000;

Federal Home Loan Bank Board:

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (increase of $75,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation" (increase of $6,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Federal Maritime Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: "Salaries and expenses", $115,000;

Federal Power Commission: "Salaries and expenses". $300,000;

Federal Trade Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $312,500;

General Accounting Office: "Salaries and expenses", $535,000;

Intergovernmental commissions:

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Interstate Commerce Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $625,000;

National Labor Relations Board: "Salaries and expenses", $548,100;

National Mediation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $27,000;

Renegotiation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $30,000;

Small Business Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $150,000;

Smithsonian Institution:

"Salaries and expenses", $453,000;

"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", $66,000;

Tariff Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $46,000;

Tax Court of the United States: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

United States Information Agency: "Salaries and expenses", $1,005,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

Operating expenses:

"General operating expenses", $325,800, of which $4,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $1,400 from the motor vehicle parking account), $800 from the water fund, and $100 from the sanitary sewage works fund;

"Health and welfare", $920,500;

"Highways and traffic", $95,900, of which $78,000 shall be payable from the highway fund;

"Sanitary engineering", $253,000, of which $59,300 shall be payable from the water fund and $20,700 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1966.

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 202. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1966, limiting

the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Passed the House of Representatives March 29, 1966.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 1103

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14012

[Report No. 1137]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

APRIL 1, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

APRIL 25, 1966

Reported with amendments

H. R. 14012
AN ACT

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued April 28, 1966
For actions of April 27, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 70

CONTENTS

Animal research....7,22,27
Appropriations..1,21,32,41
Balance of payments.....26
Cattle raising.....13
Cotton.....31
Credit.....42
Education.....18,39
Electrification.....15
Employment.....17
Ethics.....23
Exports.....3,37
Farm prices.....25,28
Farm production.....4
Farm value.....10
Federal grants.....8
Firefighters.....16
Fiscal policy.....9
Fish protein.....38
Foreign trade.....3,11,37
Inflation.....28
Information.....19
Legislative program.....27
Libraries.....18
Loans.....24,29,42
Manpower.....35
Marketing.....40
Meat exports.....3
Meat inspection.....6
Milk.....5,32
Monetary policy.....9
Opinion poll.....30
Organization.....36
Parity.....43
Pears.....40
Personnel.....17,35
Public lands.....14
Research.....7,18,20,22,27
Sales participation..29,42
School lunch.....32
School milk.....5,32
Sheep raising.....12
Summer lunch.....18
Supplemental appropriations.....1
Water pollution.....34
Watersheds.....41
Weather control.....2
Wildlife.....33

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed 2nd supplemental appropriation bill. Sen. Sparkman supported efforts to increase meat exports. Sen. Pearson recommended increased farm production for national security. House committee voted to report special summer lunch program bill.

SENATE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed, 72-12, with amendments this bill, H. R. 14012. Senate conferees were appointed. Agreed to the USDA items as reported by the Senate committee (see Digest 68). The bill had been reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee during adjournment (S. Rept. 1137) pp. [redacted] 8651-83

2. WEATHER CONTROL. The Commerce Committee submitted a report, "Weather Modification and Control" (S. Rept. 1139). p. 8590

3. MEAT EXPORTS. Sen. Sparkman announced plans of the Small Business Committee to hold further hearings on this subject and expressed a belief that additional efforts should be made to encourage exportation of livestock and meat products. pp. 8596-605

4. FARM PRODUCTION. Sen. Pearson referred to decreased CCC stocks and recommended increases in farm production, on a gradual basis, for national security reasons. pp. 8612-13

5. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire inserted a letter from AFL-CIO supporting his position on the special milk program for school children. pp. 8617-8

6. MEAT INSPECTION. Sen. Pearson criticized the Administration's proposal to charge packers for meat inspection. p. 8620

7. ANIMAL RESEARCH. Sen. Brewster inserted articles recommending that any legislation on handling of research animals be made to apply to research facilities as well as dealers. p. 8623

8. FEDERAL GRANTS. Sen. Cotton objected to the situation under which 18 States, including N. H., pay more Federal taxes than they get back as Federal grants. p. 8629

9. MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICY. Sen. Hartke referred to the Federal Reserve Board and said there is not enough coordination between monetary policy and fiscal policy. pp. 8633-4

10. FARM VALUE. Sen. Fulbright inserted an article, "Agriculture's Assets Are Two-Thirds Value All Corporations in United States." pp. 8635-6

11. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Williams, N. J., asked protection of the American dye industry in tariff negotiations. pp. 8638-9

12. SHEEP RAISING. Sen. Montoya commended a motion picture which tells the story of a sheep-raising Spanish-American family in Mexico. p. 8639

13. CATTLE RAISING. Sen. Sparkman spoke hopefully of increased cattle raising in the South and inserted a USDA statement giving information about the cattle industry in Ala. pp. 8639-41

14. PUBLIC LANDS. Sen. Morse inserted correspondence and newspaper articles regarding the proposed transfer of Russell Getty, Bureau of Land Management. pp. 8642-5

15. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Magnuson commended the start-up of the Hanford atomic steamplant. pp. 8683-8

16. FIREFIGHTERS. Concurred in the House amendments to S. J. Res. 86, to authorize the President to proclaim May 4, 1966, as a day of recognition for firefighters. This measure will now be sent to the President. p. 8689

Lack of popular participation in government has various undesirable effects. City employees need be honest and reasonably efficient but not necessarily pleasing to the helpless citizenry. Residents acquire frustration and a feeling of hopelessness in getting anything done through city government. Rules pile up, layer on layer, in the district building. And the procedure for getting anything done, including worthwhile civic undertakings, turns out to be a labyrinth. Anyone with a "good idea" finds that he needs to go through the proper department of the District government, then the Commissioners, then the Budget Bureau and the White House, then the House District Committee and the Senate District Committee and the Conference Committee of the Congress, and also the District Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, and again the Conference Committee of the Congress, and the White House. There can be subtractions to these major steps, if the proposition is so unusual as not to involve both policy and money, but there are also many additions for subcommittees of each committee and for congressional hearings. The average citizen, trying to help his community in his spare time, soon gives up in despair and goes back to his major business of earning a living.

For example, take the obvious need of a government college and/or university in the District. In every State in the Union, there is a public, accredited, tax-supported university with little or no tuition for the residents. But not in the District, except for the inadequate and about-to-die Teachers College and specialized Howard University. In the Nation's Capital, you have to pay $1,400 tuition to a private university or move into a State with a democratic form of government. Where the people have a vote, they have a university.

Or take another less significant but irritating issue, that of tax returns. The District income tax law, enacted by Congress, calls for returns similar to the Federal income tax returns, also enacted by Congress, but yet different enough to make the taxpayer do over certain schedules and thereby waste considerable work and build up indignant frustration over the waste. Over a period of several years, the Citizens Council and the related departments of the District government have developed a proposal to base the District tax on the Federal return. The District Commissioners have recommended the proposal to the Congress. There it sits, in the House and Senate District Committees. There is no opposition but, after all, it's of no concern of the folks back home.

Many examples could be given of the unfairness to conscientous Congressmen and local residents of the present complicated and disorganized system. There are also questions of conflicts of interests, such as in taxing cigarettes and a payroll tax on suburbanites. To me, however, the basic question is whether Congress has enough faith in people to let them govern themselves. Unfortunately, the answer to date is faith in people in all other places, even in undeveloped countries, but not in people here.

THE GOVERNMENT'S LOSS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is always regrettable when the Government loses the services of a man who is capable and who is dedicated to the service of this country.

We are experiencing such a loss in the resignation of Jack Valenti, who is leaving the White House as Special Assistant to the President.

I and many of my colleagues have known Jack Valenti since his early days of White House service. I believe they will agree with me that he has shown himself to be a capable and hard-working public servant and, above that, a true gentleman.

Perhaps my feelings are best summed up by an editorial about Mr. Valenti in the Washington Post of April 27 which said:

His service to the President has been of a kind that mere money could not buy.

I could think of no statement more accurate or true.

The Post's editorial tribute to Mr. Valenti is so well taken that I would like for all Members to see it, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALENTI'S RESIGNATION

The resignation of Jack J. Valenti, as assistant to President Johnson, leaves a void in the White House establishment that will not be filled easily. He served the President in a way that most administrators wish they were served and in a way that few of them are served. He had the personal qualities that permitted him to subordinate his own wishes and inclination completely to the desires of the President. The President's word was his law—and he was often able to anticipate the "word" because he so well understood the moods and wishes and impulses of the Chief Executive.

One can hardly begrudge the hard-working Valenti the handsome position he has been given by the Motion Picture Association. He now will have many bosses, instead of just one; but it is to be doubted that he will find his burdens increased in proportion to the number of officials he now must serve.

His service to the President has been of a kind that mere money could not buy. But money more commensurate with the duties involved ought to be made available for the officials like Valenti who so greatly contribute to the smooth operation of the Federal Government. No doubt he will be worth a great deal to the Motion Picture Producers Association; but he was worth a great deal more to the people of the United States than he ever received while serving them at the White House.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of the Senate that we have as guests today three members of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, our friendly and wonderful ally which has 23,000 of its soldiers serving with our soldiers in Vietnam. Korea is a country which shares the same aims and concerns which we share. Our countries are friends in war and peace.

We have three distinguished guests present this afternoon. I ask them to stand as I introduce them.

It is my honor to present to the Senate Mr. Chung Tae Sung, Mr. Han Byung Il, and Mr. Hak Jin Oh, Congressmen of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea.

(The distinguished visitors rose in their places and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is very happy to welcome you here today.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14012) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, after discussing the matter with the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the Supplemental Appropriation Subcommittee, and the distinguished ranking member of that committee, the Senator from Colorado, that the vote on the rent supplemental——

Mr. PASTORE. Subsidy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Subsidy—be taken at 3:30 and that the time between now and then be at the disposal of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Senator PASTORE], and the ranking Republican member [Senator ALLOTT].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I object.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no unanimous consent?

Mr. PASTORE. Not yet. Mr. President, we will come back to that.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1966, H.R. 14012. It was reported to the House of Representatives on Friday, March 25, and passed by the House on Tuesday, March 29.

The Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals began hearings that same day. Hearings continued through Thursday, March 31, and the subcommittee recessed awaiting additional estimates for consideration in this supplemental bill.

These additional estimates were received at noon, Wednesday, April 20, and hearings were held Thursday morning, April 21.

The committee held its executive markup session on Monday, April 25, and the committee bill, report, and hearings are available to Senators today.

The following recapitulation will highlight the bill and major committee amendments:

Increased pay costs totaling $1,168,478,120—41.7 percent—to meet increased

pay pursuant to legislation effective October 1965;

Mandatory Federal contributions to the States for public assistance, $381 million—13.6 percent;

Veterans' compensation and pensions, $288 million—10.3 percent;

Elementary and secondary education activities in the amount of $184 million—6.6 percent;

Asian Development Bank, $140 million—5 percent. This is a Senate committee amendment;

Payment to the trust fund for health insurance for the aged, in the amount of $125,800,000—4.5 percent;

Post Office Department, $121,799,000—4.3 percent—which includes $25 million by committee amendment;

Payment for military service credits, $105 million—3.7 percent;

The President's disaster relief fund, $75 million—2.7 percent, including $30 million added by the committee;

Other disaster or emergency needs for the Farmers Home Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and certain Department of the Interior agencies, $46,329,000—1.7 percent—which includes $33,042,000 added by the committee;

Payments to school districts, $41 million—1.5 percent; and $39 million—1.4 percent for Vocational Rehabilitation Administration grants to the States.

This listing totals $2,715,406,120, or 97 percent of the $2,801,126,003 recommended by the committee.

The details describing these and other items are to be found in the committee report acompanying the bill and include references to all items in the bill.

The bill, as it came from the House, contained $12 million in contract authorization for the rent supplement program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The budget request had been in the amount of $30 million. The committee has voted to eliminate the item from the supplemental bill for fiscal year 1966. It is my intention at the appropriate time to resist the committee amendment, and I have already given notice to the committee of my desire to do so.

I shall be very happy to answer any questions that Senators may wish to ask.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Rhode Island will ask unanimous consent to have the bill treated as original text except for the amendment on rent supplements.

Mr. PASTORE. Rent supplements; that is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator, too, about the following: I had in mind offering an amendment if the committee amendment striking out this provision failed. I had in mind an amendment which would at least increase the amount to what is really needed and/or—and I use those words in the conjunctive sense—doing something about this proviso.

I have no desire to impede the affairs of the leadership in terms of time, but I ask the Senator from Rhode Island, in arranging for whatever unanimous consent he desires, to bear those two things in mind, so that they will be provided for.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator indulge me for a moment while I propound a parliamentary inquiry? This is a very sensitive point of nicety that I think ought to be resolved at this moment.

Mr. President, the committee has recommended an amendment to delete the $12 million that was passed by the House. Now I shall make a unanimous-consent request that the Senate accept the committee amendments en bloc, without prejudice, so that amendments may be made thereto. But I shall except from that unanimous-consent request the committee amendment with reference to the deletion of the $12 million item. The question arises—and that committee amendment will be before the Senate at the proper time—if the Senate sustains the committee—in other words, if the majority are in the affirmative—and the committee action is sustained with reference to the deletion of the $12 million, may the Senator from New York at that time propose an amendment to allocate $30 million for the same purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). If that amendment were agreed to and the item were thereby thrown out, the Senator from New York could offer an amendment de novo involving the same subject, to be considered by the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, if the Senate should sustain the deletion of $12 million, the Senator from New York may originate a new amendment asking for $30 million instead of the $12 million that already has been deleted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As long as he makes some other changes to insure that the change is substantative.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make another parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. On the other hand, Mr. President, if the amendment is rejected and the provision as it came from the other body thereby remains intact, may the Senator from New York move to strike the figure of $12 million and insert another figure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion to strike is rejected, then the House amendment will be open to amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Also, there would then be open either to amendment or to a point of order the proviso contained in the amendment which is before the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House language is not open to a point of order.

Mr. JAVITS. But it is open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that I would be willing to work out a unanimous-consent agreement which would protect my right to endeavor to deal with this question, once we have something before us with which we can deal.

Mr. PASTORE. If I may say a word—and I hope I may have the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader when I say this—because of a situation which concerns several Senators, it is desired to have a vote at 3:30 p.m. on the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. May I finish my statement? Then I shall be happy to yield.

I understand that the Senator from New York expects to offer an amendment after that vote is taken. Therefore, we can enter into a unanimous-consent agreement as to any other amendments that he desires to offer de novo after 3:30 p.m., and I do not think there would be any objection to that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand then, no amendments to this section, no amendment de novo, and no substitute would be in order until the committee amendment had been voted up or down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments must be disposed of first. The committee amendments are open to amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. During the course of the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I again ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he wishes a unanimous-consent agreement to protect the right to debate and vote on amendments to the committee amendments before the hour set for the vote on this committee amendment—to wit, 3:30 p.m.?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am wondering whether the purpose could be served if in the unanimous-consent request to agree to all committee amendments en bloc, all committee amendments were agreed to with the understanding that the Senator could then offer as his first amendment the House amendment dealing with rent supplements. Then the amendment would be open to debate by the Senator from New York.

Mr. PASTORE. No; the Senator from Rhode Island does not choose to do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Otherwise, if I understand correctly, the amendment of the Senator from New York, after we have disposed of the other amendment, might be subject to a point of order.

Mr. PASTORE. It might be, but I cannot subscribe to the idea that we should agree to the committee amendments and then begin to consider an amendment de novo. I was not born yesterday. The vote will be on the committee amendment, and if it is a tie vote, it will not carry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what I have in mind, too.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the rent supplement committee amendment be taken at 3:30 p.m. today, provided, however, that debate on any amendment to the said committee amendment be limited to 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of said amendment and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the manager of the bill, or whomever he may designate; and that the time on the committee amendment be divided and controlled by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask, in addition, that notwithstanding the time limitation of 3:30, the time shall be used and a vote had on any amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. That would all depend. If the Senator offered five amendments and we took 40 minutes apiece—

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I could object to the proposal, but I do not want to. I think my good faith in the Senate is pretty well established. I understand what we are trying to do, and I shall cooperate in doing so, but I am not going to lose any rights because of it.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not want the Senator to lose any rights. No one is accommodating me by voting at 3:30. We may be accommodating other Senators. I am not pressed for time.

Mr. JAVITS. The phrase is entirely satisfactory provided it does not cut off the right to offer an amendment and the right to have a vote. I can assure my colleague that I think it will work out practically.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, with that assurance, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, with the exception of the committee amendment on page 5, line 1 through line 17, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered for the purpose of further amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, after line 2, to insert:

"CHAPTER I"

On page 2, after line 3, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Farmers Home Administration

"For an additional amount for the 'Emergency Credit Revolving Fund,' $30,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 2, line 9, to change the Chapter number from "I" to "II".

On page 3, after line 6, to insert:

"CHAPTER III"

On page 3, after line 7, to insert:

"FOREIGN OPERATIONS FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"Asian Development Bank

"For subscriptions to the Asian Development Bank, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, to remain available until expended, $140,000,000, of which $20,000,000 shall be available for the first installment on paid-in capital stock, $20,000,000 shall be available for the second installment on such stock, and $100,000,000 shall be available for the entire subscription to callable capital stock."

On page 3, line 18, to change the Chapter number from "II" to "IV".

On page 3, after line 19, to insert:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

"Operation and Maintenance of Properties

"For an additional amount for 'Operation and maintenance of properties', $12,000".

On page 4, line 4, to strike out "$10,180,000" and insert "$12,681,000".

On page 4, after line 5, to insert:

"GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'General operating expenses', $3,000,000."

On page 4, line 20, after "(Public Law 89–41)", to strike out "$45,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000".

On page 5, line 18, to change the Chapter number from "III" to "V".

On page 6, line 8, after the word "protection", to strike out "$1,028,000" and insert "$1,245,000".

On page 6, line 12, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$827,000" and insert "$892,000".

On page 6, line 14, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,711,000".

At the top of page 7, to insert:

"OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

"Administration of territories

"For an additional amount of 'Administration of Territories', $2,500,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 7, line 8, after the word "resources", to strike out "$148,000" and insert "$193,000".

On page 7, line 12, after the word "resources", to strike out "$658,000" and insert "$712,700".

On page 8, after line 1, to insert:

"FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $18,000."

On page 8, line 10, to strike out "$18,0000" and insert "$68,000".

On page 8, line 14, to change the Chapter number from "IV" to "VI".

On page 10, line 10, after "$950,000", to insert a comma and "of which $100,000 for interest payments shall remain available until expended and $850,000 for advances shall remain available until June 30, 1968".

On page 10, line 23, after "$184,000,000", to insert a comma and "to be available from March 1, 1966, and all obligations incurred during the period from such date to the date of enactment of this Act, are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the authorization for the purpose: *Provided,* That in addition whenever the Commissioner of Education shall have approved an application for a project in accordance with said title II subject to the amount of entitlements available to the States for such purpose, the cost of such project shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government".

On page 11, line 21, after "1965", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$9,500,000".

On page 14, line 20, to change the Chapter number from "V" to "VII".

On page 14, after line 21, to insert: "SENATE".

On page 14, after line 22, to insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"Inquires and investigations

"For additional amount for 'Inquiries and Investigations', $200,000."

On page 15, line 16, to change the Chapter number from "VI" to "VIII".

On page 15, line 23, after the word "general", to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$7,350,000".

On page 16, after line 15, to insert:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"Upper Colorado River storage project

"For an additional amount for 'Upper Colorado River Basin Fund', $1,400,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Loan Program', Bureau of Reclamation."

On page 17, line 1, to change the Chapter number from "VII" to "IX".

On page 17, after line 13, to strike out:

"In addition to the amount heretofore made available in the appropriation under this head for the current fiscal year for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), not to exceed $25,000 shall be available in such appropriation for such compensation and expenses."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Fees and Expenses', including not to exceed $25,000 for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses, general legal activities', fiscal year 1966."

On page 18, after line 12, to insert:

"1967 ALASKA CENTENNIAL

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Alaska Centennial Act of 1966, including administrative expenses, to remain available until June 30, 1968, $4,600,000, of which not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for grants to the State of Alaska, and not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits are a part of the Centennial celebration."

On page 19, after line 2, to insert:

"INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

"Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center

"For expenses necessary to conduct the studies and submit the reports, and for related expenses, required by section 2(b) of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89–355), as to the proposed participation by the United States, by foreign countries, and industry in Interama, $160,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 20, line 16, to change the chapter number from "VIII" to "X".

On page 20, line 20, after the word "Operations", to strike out "$269,904,000" and insert "$294,904,000".

On page 21, line 4, to change the chapter number from "IX" to "XI".

On page 21, at the beginning of line 10, to insert "Senate Document Numbered 87 and", and in line 11, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$10,251,798" and insert "$10,828,683".

On page 22, after line 6, to insert: "Senate:".

On page 22, after line 7, to insert: "'Compensation of the Vice President and Senators', $8,065;".

On page 22, after line 9, to insert: "'Salaries, officers and employees', $543,105;".

On page 22, after line 10, to insert: "'Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate', $7,425;".

On page 22, after line 12, to insert: "Contingent expenses of the Senate:".

On page 22, after line 13, to insert: "'Senate policy committees', $9,940;".

On page 22, after line 14, to insert: " 'Automobiles and maintenance', $840;".

On page 22, after line 15, to insert: " 'Inquiries and investigations', $116,865, including $3,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;".

On page 22, after line 18, to insert: " 'Folding documents,' $945;".

On page 22, after line 19, to insert: " 'Miscellaneous items', $32,065, including $16,200 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961;".

On page 25, after line 10, to insert: " 'Senate office building', $31,000;".

On page 25, after line 11, to insert: " 'Senate garage', $600;".

On page 30, line 24, after the figures "$89,000", to insert: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

On page 31, line 4, after the figures "$50,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

On page 31, line 8, after the figures "$320,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', fiscal year 1966;".

On page 31, line 12, after the numerals "1967", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', fiscal year 1966;".

On page 31, line 16, after the figures "$125,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

On page 31, line 20, after the figures "$160,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,".

On page 32, line 1, after the figures "$100,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,".

On page 32, line 6, after the figures "$90,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

On page 32, line 12, after the figures $500,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics,' Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

On page 32, line 16, after the figures "$1,200,000", to insert "of which $754,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

On page 33, line 2, after the figures "$222,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,".

On page 34, after line 14, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

"The limitation contained in section 606 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1966 on the funds available for the operation of overseas dependents schools is hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by Public Law 89-391."

On page 36, line 15, after the word "Administration", to strike out "(increases of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses)", and in lieu thereof to insert "(increase of $575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses);".

On page 44, line 9, after the word "Operations", to strike out "$9,500,000" and insert "$8,000,000".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the exception to which I referred in my unanimous-consent agreement which was just agreed to relates to the rent supplement program. The committee voted to strike this item. I voted in the negative at the time. I gave notice to the members of the committee that I would pursue further the restoration of this $12 million on the floor of the Senate.

That is the reason for my making this exception. That is what I propose to do.

It is my understanding that the amendment on page 5, line 1 through line 17, automatically becomes the pending business for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 1, strike the language down through line 17, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

Rent Supplement Program

For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $100,000; *Provided*, That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK read as follows: Page 5, line 9, strike the figure "$12,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000,000."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is high time that we face up to our responsibility in respect to this rent supplement program. It is high time that we assert some measure of our feeling that when we deliberately and after very intensive debate legislate a program, it shall not be completely nullified by the appropriation process, although it appears it is already partially nullified.

It is high time that we decide this matter, for we have had two separate legislatures here for too long. We have had the Congress and we have had the Appropriations Committee. We will either be honest men with a conscience and limit the appropriation process to what it is supposed to be—which is to determine how much money should be spent for something and how much is justified—or we will stop fooling ourselves and turn everything over to the Committee on Appropriations.

It was a devastating blow to a balanced housing program to have this rent subsidy program go down the drain the last time with $450,000 in planning funds. However, we were able to grin and bear it.

I should like to pay outstanding tribute to my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who has been leading this fight and who led it manfully at that time. He said: "Let us try it this way, and let us assume that it will bear out the investment which we are making, and use patience in getting the Congress to understand that we are not trying to rush into anything, that we are really genuinely and honestly trying to get the program well understood, to be absolutely positive the people really want it before we put up money for it."—a very hardheaded attitude on the part of a true liberal. That is the way I feel about the Senator from Rhode Island.

Now, Mr. President, everything promised has happened. We have tried it. We have used the planning funds. We have made the surveys of practicality and of buyability, as it were, by the people who want it. We have found that it is a very useful thing, and that it can be spread widely around the country. All of that evidence is in.

And when it is all in, Mr. President, all we do is strike it out; and we even add insult to injury by striking out what is to us not just a minimum figure, but only a token figure, for all practical purposes.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Weaver, testified that the survey taken in the last year had shown that there is a demand for at least 100,000 units; $12 million, Mr. President, will purchase at the very best 20,000 units. He said that not only is there a demand for 100,000 units, but that that demand comes from 350 localities. That testimony is found at page 438 and page 451 of the record.

Then, Mr. President, under very intensive questioning by Senator PASTORE—who, I repeat, has been very hardheaded about this matter—the Secretary testified that if we appropriated but $12 million, we would be so fractionalizing the situation around the country as to very materially reduce the likelihood that we could really prove anything in the way of the practicality of the program alleviating the housing problems of people of low incomes. The program would be reduced to such "bits and pieces," as he put it, around the country, so very heavily broken up, and it would pose al-

most impossible problems of how to distribute that money among the 350 localities without cutting off many which really wanted to try it out.

Senator PASTORE, not satisfied with that, pressed the Secretary as follows—the questioning was so intelligent that I ask the privilege of quoting it.

He said:

In view of the fact that you went before the committee and asked for $30 million and they gave $12 million, I was wondering what would be a reasonable halfway, in-between point that would obviate this being a burdensome experiment as against being not the program you would like, but a reasonable program that would be in the public interest without any unnecessary waste of money.

The budget request was for $30 million; this was all in the budget, and there were no problems about the fact that we were going outside the President's budget. The budget request was for $30 million, which the House cut to $12 million.

Here is what Secretary Weaver said in response to Senator PASTORE's honest and challenging question:

This is very hard to answer, but I would certainly feel that it would have to be more than the $12 million and off the top of my head I would say at least around $20 million to give us the leeway to have in these areas—

Then Senator PASTORE interrupted and said:

You say that $12 million will build 20,000 units?

Secretary WEAVER. Yes.

Senator PASTORE. 20,000 units over the whole complex of this great, vast land of ours would not be a great number of units, would it?

Secretary WEAVER. No, sir.

Senator PASTORE. You would have to concentrate more or less in a few sections, would you not?

Secretary WEAVER. Yes. What we would probably have to do in order to keep the morale up and the interest would be just the opposite—we would have to spread it so thin across as many areas as possible.

Senator PASTORE. Doesn't that add to the administration of the program?

Secretary WEAVER. It adds to the administrative cost—

And so on. In other words, are we going to do anything, really, or are we just going to spread this so thin that it will tend to defeat itself?

After all, we will have to vote; those of us who will vote for this program will have to stand against the Appropriations Committee's majority now, narrow as that majority was. If we are to stand against it anyway, my purpose in offering this perfecting amendment is that we stand against it, in decency and responsibility, for something which will improve the program.

That is my whole argument. If there is not a majority in this Chamber, Mr. President, for the $12 million, then, obviously, there is no majority for the $20 million. But I respectfully submit that anybody who feels that this is a practicable program, and wants to try it out, should vote for the $20 million rather than the $12 million, because in that way according to the best testimony we have, we will at least give it a fair shake, and by voting for the $12 million, you will be running yourself down the drain; you will be for it, but not for it enough to make it really stand up and be a success.

That is the essence of the argument, and that is why I have taken the position I have.

Mind you, I do not know what Senator PASTORE will do. I hope and pray that he will vote for my amendment. But even if he votes against it, I still say he is a hero, he is a leader in this field, and he is all for it.

But it seems to me to be my duty, in all logic, if there is a majority in the Chamber—and we shall soon find out—who favor any appropriation at all, to say to my fellow Senators, "If you are for it, at least be for it to the extent that it will have a reasonable chance to be succcssful, and be a program of which we could all be proud."

I know some will draw conclusions that by the offer of this amendment, we weaken our position. Mr. President, we have all been herc a long time. We understand that every vote stands on its own. It seems to me that in all logic, decency, and self-respect, the majority—if there is a majority—should have an opportunity to say, "We are not only for this, but we are for it to the extent of giving it a chance to be a program we can be proud of."

If we are for it, we might as well be for it to the extent that it succeeds, rather than be for it only to the extent that it will have a built-in guarantee of possibly—I shall not say probably—not succeeding.

What is involved, Mr. President, $8 million? If we are going for the $12 million, Mr. President, I think those of us who are going to go for it may very well consult our own best judgment—this is for our side—and go for the $20 million. Because that seems to be the hard-rock minimum that will really give us a program, and not just a collection of bits and pieces.

Mr. President, a large group of us, consisting of both Democrats and Republicans—15 Senators—issued a joint statement in opposition to the rider on the rent supplement bill attached by the House of Representatives. The statement was signed by Senators CASE, CLARK, DOUGLAS, HART, myself, both KENNEDYS, MONDALE, MORSE, MUSKIE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, TYDINGS, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is the class of opinion to which I am appealing.

This statement said that we strenuously objected to the local veto proviso in the amendment. I shall not move to strike it; I am following my beloved colleague's advice. He thinks it is wiser not to press the matter. He thinks we can live with it; that it is not good, but he thinks that we can live with it.

All right, I accept that. But I cannot, in all honesty and candor, look myself in the face if I do not at least try to make it a respectable program, instead of a bits-and-pieces program, as long as I am going to vote for it anyway.

This group of 15 Senators was ready, not just to go for $20 million; they were ready to go for $30 million. The statement says, "We therefore urge that the Senate strike the local veto rider from the language of the appropriation bill. In addition, we hope that the entire $30 million requested for the program will be appropriated."

In other words, they went for the total budget sum, not just the $20 million.

In conclusion, there is no need to take a great deal of time about this. We have discussed thc program from A to Z time and again. We all understand exactly what is in it. I appeal to the majority, if there is a majority—if there is not, we are licked altogether—"at least vote for something responsible and respectable. At least vote for a program which has a chance to succeed, instead of runing it down the drain, by determining to vote against diluting it into a program of bits and pieces too small to do any good, by voting the minimum amount which the Secretary says will give it a chance to succeed."

I repeat, Mr. President, we are really doing ourselves a favor by setting up the program for $20 million rather than $12 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am placcd in a rather awkward position, because I think by the unanimous-consent agreement I have been designated as the keeper of the time for the opposition. Certainly I do not wish to be in opposition to this kind of amendment. I want my distinguished fellow Senator from New York to know that I sympathize greatly with his position, and I agree with it. The only thing that disturbs me a littlc bit is the practicality of the situation.

Thc committee voted 15 to 12 to knock out the $12 million. The serious question here on the floor of the Senate is, How does the membership of the Senate feel with reference to the restoration? Of course now we are talking, not only about restoration, but about going $8 million above that.

I do not think that I should be the one who should guide the time in opposition. I do wish to speak for about 4 or 5 minutes.

If it is agreeable to the distinguished Senator who is the ranking member of the subcommittee [Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota], I should like to have him manage the time after I have taken about 5 minutes.

How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes to each side.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall take 5 minutes, and allocate the remaining 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota to do what he wishes in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Is that satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Either way, though I would be perfectly happy to have the Senator from Rhode Island do it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe that what I should do at this juncture—because we shall have sufficient timc to argue the merits of the program a little later, or before we come to a vote at 3:30 o'clock—is to point out to the Senate cxactly what kind of program we are talking about this afternoon.

Are we here to glorify and embellish the rich, or are we in this Chamber this afternoon to give a little consideration to the poor?

Who must these poor be before they can be considered at all for the program?

They must fall in the category of qualifying for public housing. That is the first qualification. Over and above that, before anyone can come under the program, he must be a person who has been displaced by governmental action.

By that, it means that if we build a highway or freeway through a slum, or have taken some action which displaces someone, then that is another consideration.

But, we do not even stop there.

There is another condition which includes the household head or spouse, if 62 years of age, or even older, and that would be another requirement.

Then, we do not even stop there.

There is another requirement, too, that the household head or spouse must be physically handicapped. The next to the last category includes living in substandard housing. The last category is for persons who occupy or did occupy living units destroyed or extensively damaged by a natural disaster. They would be included.

This afternoon, we are talking about the poor in relation to this program. Before we set a date for the hearings, I received many telegram from several distinguished clergymen who were very much interested in the program. I believe that we should recite for the RECORD what these men had to say.

Their names are:

Reverend Street; Mr. Marshall; Reverend Walker; Reverend McManus; Reverend Goodwin; and the Reverend Wendt.

This is what I said to these gentlemen:

Senator PASTORE. All right, gentlemen.

Will you step forward and take these seats? We will hear you one at a time. I have you listed in this order: Reverend Street, Mr. Marshall, Reverend Walker, Reverend McManus, Reverend Goodwin, and Reverend Wendt.

This is what Mr. Marshall said:

Mr. MARSHALL. I purposefully made my remarks brief. I thought this would be appreciated but I would be glad to answer questions if there are any.

What he brought out was the fact that this would take care of the poor, and that was his objective.

We had the representatives of the Friends Neighborhood Guild; the Philadelphia Housing Authority program; the Private Enterprise Housing programs; and we had a clergyman from New Orleans, and several ministers from the South. Every one of them testified how important this program was and why we should raise the figure from $12 million to $30 million, which is the authorization amount.

Well, when it came to the markup of the bill, the Senator from Rhode Island was somewhat surprised. The vote was 15 to 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the vote was 15 to 12 to delete the whole program which, to me, was a very sorrowful thing to happen.

I would hope that this afternoon, if we cannot get the $30 million, at least we can restore the $12 million. That is all I have to say at this time. I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from New York because the committee already knows how I feel about this matter, and I have made my position abundantly clear.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield any time to the opposition on this amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator require?

Mr. PASTORE. The time for the opposition is being managed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I need 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment, and I will also speak in favor of the amendment of the committee.

Let me say at the outset that the position I have taken has not led me to go around getting a lot of Senators to take the same position which I have taken. I have not asked a single Senator to vote with me or to take the position that I have taken.

When I offered the amendment in committee the other day to strike the $12 million, which was stricken, I did not ask a single Senator either before or during the course of that meeting to vote with me.

I have taken this position because I believe that it is right.

First of all, I invite the attention of the Senate, at least to the Senators who are now in the Chamber, to the fact that this particular item comes before the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I happen to be the ranking minority member, and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman.

The particular item that we are talking about now has never been before that subcommittee. This is a fact which should be borne in mind by every Senator.

I do not claim for myself that I am an authority, by any means, on any or all parts of public housing; nor do I believe that the chairman of that committee, if he were present in the Chamber at the moment, would make any such claim or assumption.

However, in dealing with these matters over a period of years, as we both have, I believe that we have learned a little about them.

How did this matter come up before the Senate last year?

First, it was up on an authorization. At that time, I am sure that everyone here will remember the utter and stark confusion of Members of the Senate as to who was to be embraced within the bill, and to be eligible for subsidy under it.

I believe it was finally decided by the majority here that people who earned even up to $12,000 in income could draw a rent subsidy.

When the matter went before the Supplemental Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, last year, the agency had already promulgated regulations to control the apropriation which they thought they were going to receive at that time.

The Senate did appropriate money by a narrow vote of 41 to 37. The House had refused to appropriate money. When we went to the conference committee, the House made it clear from the beginning that they were not going to appropriate any money for this program in that particular appropriation bill.

But the matter was so confused that when it did come up late in the fall befor the Senate, the HHFA, now the Department of Housing and Urban Development, had to withdraw, the day before it came up before the Senate, every regulation they had published to implement the proposed appropriation because they found out that they were more confused than anyone else.

Mr. President, not having had this matter before the regular subcommittee for appropriations in 1966, we are now asked again to have the supplemental subcommittee—not the subcommittee which has to deal with this matter and bear the responsibility for it year after year, but the supplemental subcommittee in testimony taken before the supplemental subcommittee—act upon this, and act upon the statements made by Mr. Weaver.

I can understand the interest of some people in the program, and I am not going to say that it may not have merit. I say that it has no merit today, because we have not had an opportunity to get Mr. Weaver, the Secretary of HUD, before the regular subcommittee to question him and find out exactly what he means when he talks about the various things that he is going to do under the act.

For example, when he talks about "substandard," I do not know what he is talking about. From the testimony, I would assume that he is confused as to the legislative authority by which appropriations may be made. Taking all this into consideration, I say to these people, and I say to my friend, the Senator from New York, who is advocating this particular amendment, that if he is genuinely interested in this approach

to public housing—and that is what it is, it is a new way to handle public housing, he will serve himself and he will serve his constituents better if he will permit this matter to come before the regular Appropriations Subcommittee. A hearing is now set for HUD on May 17.

In all likelihood they will have an appropriation bill by the first part of the next fiscal year, or by July 1. This committee has never delayed in its actions on these matters and I see no reason why it should do so this year.

Now, if this particular idea has merit, if in fact it will save money for the taxpayers, if in fact it calls upon the private sector of the economy to do a thing that has been done by the Government before in the matter of public housing, if all of these things are true, then I am sure that each and every one of us want the best, hardest, leanest kind of program we can get so it will work. That is my position.

My position also is that the committee charged with the responsibility for this particular appropriation should have a right and should have the opportunity to call the Secretary of HUD before it to inquire into all phases of this matter, to inquire into his interpretation of the regulations, to inquire what they mean because that committee and that committee alone will be charged, so far as the Senate is concerned, with the responsibility for the success or failure of this program.

We will have these hearings shortly. For this reason I must say that I do oppose very stringently the amendment of the Senator from New York. If he and the others whose names he read are genuinely interested in making this program work they will let it go through the normal courses and processes of the appropriate channels.

There is a great reluctance on the part of every member of the Appropriations Committee to act upon matters which do not have to be acted on in a supplemental bill. There is no overwhelming crisis that is going to come to a head in the next 2 months, May and June.

When we put this bill before the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which I am sure will be by July 1, then I think we will have had an opportunity to get all of the background. Since we are starting a program of such immense proportions, at least $150 million for 40 years, we will have a chance to look at it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want to answer the allegation made here this afternoon that this did not come before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of which I also am a member.

I want to say to my distinguished friend from Colorado I think that the Subcommittee on Supplementals and Deficiencies has just as much right, just as much jurisdiction, if I may use the word, as the Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

Why did it come before the Supplemental and Deficiency Subcommittee? It was because this law was passed not too long ago by the Senate and the Senate authorized a certain amount to expire by June 30, 1966. The regular bill before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices is to begin with appropriations available on July 1, 1966.

So that is the reason why it came before the Supplemental and Deficiency Subcommittee. What did the Senator from Rhode Island do? He invited every member, 27 of them, on the entire Appropriations Committee to come there.

There is argument this afternoon that if Senators are against it, they should say that they are against it. If Senators say, "I don't like this program; I don't want it; I am going to vote against it whether you make it 5 cents or $5 billion," I say to Senators, "All right, you are sincere in your position." But when Senators come on to the floor and say that JOHN PASTORE did not have a right to hear this, that it was not heard well, and that it was not heard fully, I say, "By what right do you think there is more jurisdiction in your subcommittee than there is to mine?"

Mr. President, that is enough.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to answer the chairman of the subcommittee. The one committee of the Congress charged with this is the Independent Offices Subcommittee. Of course, the Senator had a right to hear the matter, but his is not the subcommittee that is charged primarily with hearing items on housing and home finance.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I decline to yield at this time. Mr. President, the fallacy of this matter lies exactly where we are to date. We are appropriating almost $25 billion in our supplemental appropriations this year. This is the answer to this matter and it should be considered by regular committees in the regular course, regardless of what the Senator from Rhode Island may think.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes in support of the position taken by the ranking member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, which handles this type of legislation.

There is $2.8 billion in this supplemental bill. I am the ranking Republican on the committee and I say to the chairman that he did the very best job that he could covering the 75 items. But it cannot be done half as good as had the regular committees handled these items.

In addition, when the regular committee takes up the bill they can approve the $35 million being requested, plus an additional $30 million if need be.

Mr. President, this is not a small bill at all.

If the authorization is entered into the cost of this program, over a 40-year period, which is authorized, it will be approximately $6 billion. That amount is not peanuts. If we had a little more time, I am sure Mr. Weaver, the Administrator, would agree he could improve the program greatly.

What a difference there was in the testimony this year and the testimony last year when he had time to think it over. Why not wait for 3 or 4 weeks when we could improve and make this a better program?

It may seem to some to be inappropriate for me to be speaking on this subject since we do not have a big slum area in my State; but we do have America's first citizens, the American Indians. This measure would not cover them. There is no worse housing in America than the Indians have, so I have an interest in housing. I am not opposed to the principle of helping poor people, but I believe people trained in welfare programs should rightfully have some voice in this program if it is to be a success.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, I speak as a Senator from the State which has the largest and most populous city in the United States, the city of New York, for which we ought to be very proud rather than, as I often find, apologetic.

Mr. President, there is only one theme which I have. The Senate is the conscience of the Nation. If our committees are slow, take time, and have not deliberated the matter enough we cannot absolve them, but we must bail them out of it by acting ourselves.

The Senator from Rhode Island was right. The appropriation called for $30 million prior to July 1, 1966.

Carry this matter over to when the regular legislative committee acts and there are destroyed the people who have a right to look to this program for some relief. That is what I am here to talk about.

The Senator from Colorado said:

> If you are well advised, you will wait; there is no overwhelming crisis.

There is an overwhelming crisis. Do people have to be killed to prove it, as they did in Watts, Harlem, New York, and Rochester? How many peole have to be killed in order to prove that there is an overwhelming crisis? What is $8 billion in view of the entire $2.5 billion?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator knows those clamoring for delay this afternoon would not vote for it in the final analysis even if it were for 20 cents. They do not believe in the program and this is a delaying tactic to kill it.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Rhode Island sits on this committee. Who knows better than he, and he has just spoken.

I like this program because it is dignified for the poor and it deals with the

poor who are making an effort to support themselves.

The Secretary testified it does not extend to welfare clients. It extends to people who earn money. It does not put the poor in ghettos. It distributes them around with other people so they can learn to live like other people and aspire to be like other people.

One of the vicious things about public housing is if they get somewhere in life they have to be moved out. Here is an automatically adjusting answer: Get somewhere in life; here you stay where you are, but you pay your rent. It seems to me that this is a program well worthy of trial and we should give it a break.

My entire argument is dominated by the Secretary who said, "You get into a situation where you have to do teeny-weeny things." If Senators are for this bill they should vote for it. Do not make it a teeny-weeny vote or a teeny-weeny thing.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator feel that without rent controls, the sum of $15 or $20 million, or whatever it might be, would be completely gobbled up?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not.

Mr. AIKEN. Without being a benefit to the people it is intended to help.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not. I tell the Senator that 90 percent of the program will be for new construction; the Secretary testified to that. It is necessary to have this kind of bill to bring about that new construction, and the new construction will be fully safeguarded against exactly what the Senator fears.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the program apply only to new construction?

Mr. JAVITS. The Secretary testified that 90 percent would apply to new construction.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it be written into the contract that the rents could not be raised?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows, I know, and everybody else knows that we get more complaints about increases in rents than about increases in any other prices.

Mr. JAVITS. The program would be operated on a contractual basis and would be fundamentally based upon the rent-paying ability of the family itself.

Mr. AIKEN. I would like to help the people whom the Senator has in mind, but I have had the fear that without controls the program would fail.

Mr. JAVITS. I can assure the Senator that I do not see any such really practical danger in this program. I think this is the first time we have had a chance to get off the rabbit-track of public housing and really make a new effort to do the right thing. I say let us do it reasonably and practicably, instead of in a teeny-weeny way.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has one minute remaining.

Mr. JAVITS. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to reply to two things. First of all, the $30 million for this year would not be lost under the formula. The amount that can be authorized and appropriated next year is $65 million—the $30 million plus $35 million. The fund will accumulate in that way.

Second, I say again to the chairman of the subcommittee that I have never questioned his integrity, I do not do so now, and I wish he would not imply that he is questioning mine. When he says I have made up my mind, he is wrong. I have talked with other Senators who think the same way I do, who will not vote for this proposal today, but who may vote for it after July 1, if we ever get to meaningful hearings and have a right to go into this in full with the Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining time.

We had meaningful hearings on the authorization bill; we had meaningful debates; and we passed the bill. Then we had meaningful hearings and meaningful debates, and appropriated planning funds. The planning funds were used, and a report was made which said that the program was practicable and meaningful. If we decide to do anything about the program now, this is the way to do it. We say we still have to have other meaningful reports, other meaningful hearings, before we finally decide what we ought to do about it.

In the meantime, let Senators who question my use of the term "crisis" take a walk in Harlem or in Bedford-Stuyvesant, in Watts, or in the slums of Rochester; then they will see what our delays are doing to the people. I do not say it must be done all at once, like a shot. A program is in beginning, ready to go. It is practicable. There are applications for it. What are we holding it up for? I think we are holding it up because we are against it.

Mr. PASTORE. I assure the Senator that this program has been given all the time it deserved. I do not care what committee it goes before from now on. No committee could give it more time than we have. It could not give it more conscientious attention than we gave it. On that I stake my honor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the amendment subject to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This amendment is subject to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois offers another amendment, how much time will be allotted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes to each side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am reluctant to offer a further amendment; but if there were no objection to a unanimous consent request for about 4 minutes, I would be quite content and not offer another amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no objection, of course. The minority leader may take as much time as he wishes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to conform to the rules.

Mr. President, the very distinguished and eloquent Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] said that if any Senator were against this proposal, why not proclaim it? Well, let me be as candid as my feeble endowments can interpret the English language. I say I am against it.

Mr. PASTORE. Good for you.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice from the transcript of the hearings that there probably are 51 cities, with populations over 250,000, that would be eligible. There are another 20 cities, with a population under 250,000, which would be eligible.

Mr. President, this is a coincidence. I live in a modest sized community in Illinois that bears the name Pekin. It got its name in this way: About 130 years ago a farmer came to that area when there was a controversy about naming the town. The settlers left it to his wife to name it. She took down maps, followed that parallel of latitude, and discovered that the town was on the same parallel of latitude as Pekin, China. That is how my town got its name. Officially, by the census, its population is 28,146. I think it is probably 30,000.

In my hometown a family that had an income of $4,200 would be eligible. In Omaha, Nebr., a family having an income of $4,700 would be eligible. In the great metropolitan center of the Empire State, meaning New York, a family having an income of $6,100 would be eligible.

There is a very interesting qualification. The bill provides that increases in income due to the temporary employment of a secondary member of the family or to the part-time employment of a student member of the family need not be reported. Those are flexible limits.

As I recall from reading an article in Reader's Digest, the FHA, which would make the determination, in 87 out of 89 projects went away beyond the actual cost of the land involved and submitted an excessive estimate for the purposes of the loan. I do not propose to have an agency like that undertake to administer this kind of program, which in years to come could cost not a mere $12 million or $9.5 million or $30 million, but could run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. The potential for abuses is enormous.

It is rather ironic that we take the cream of our youngsters and send them to Vietnam, where their housing facilities are ramshackle, to say the least, and where in most cases there are no housing facilities at all. But we bleed here because if a family has an income of $4,200 or $4,700 or $6,100, we will dip into the Federal till. Why not go back to the administration of President Roosevelt, whose mellifluous tone went over the country when he talked about one-third ill fed, one-third ill clad, one-third ill housed? Let us send the amendment back. Let us add the grocery bill and the clothing bill as well as the housing bill, because they are parts of creature necessities.

This proposal ought to be defeated and the position of the committee sustained. If I had the right to do it, I would strike it out entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is something that is going to be noxious in American life before we get through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Do I correctly understand that a "yea" vote is a vote to substitute $20 million for $12 million, and that the vote will come later on whether to strike out the whole provision?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is correct.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent because of death in his immediate family and is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is detained on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 69, as follows:

[No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Douglas	McGee	Proxmire
Hart	Mondale	Ribicoff
Inouye	Morse	Tydings
Javits	Muskie	Williams, N.J.

NAYS—69

Aiken	Fong	Montoya
Allott	Fulbright	Morton
Anderson	Gore	Moss
Bartlett	Harris	Mundt
Bass	Hartke	Murphy
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Bennett	Hill	Pearson
Boggs	Holland	Prouty
Brewster	Hruska	Randolph
Burdick	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cannon	Kuchel	Smith
Carlson	Lausche	Sparkman
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Cotton	Long, La.	Symington
Curtis	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dirksen	McCarthy	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McIntyre	Yarborough
Ervin	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Bible	Mansfield	Russell, Ga.
Church	McNamara	Saltonstall
Dodd	Miller	Smathers
Gruening	Neuberger	
Hayden	Russell, S.C.	

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand there are other amendments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield time to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I speak as a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which heard all the witnesses when this legislation was considered, and as a member of the Appropriations Committee that acted on this proposal last Monday.

This rent subsidy program has been seriously maligned and misunderstood. It suffers unfortunately and unfairly by its label. We are all against subsidies especially for something new like rent. But, Mr. President, this is a private enterprise proposal. It is a substitute, not a supplement, for public housing. Public housing is a rent supplement program under Government auspices; but this proposed rent subsidy program is privately sponsored, privately built, privately managed, and privately owned.

Furthermore, it will save public money on two counts. The agency's figure is $50 per month average Government subsidy for public housing, and $40 per month for the rent supplement.

Finally, Mr. President, I would point out that when a tenant qualifies for public housing, he pays 20 percent of his income in rent; but the rent supplement program is more conservative, he is to pay 25 percent of his income in rent before he receives a nickel of Federal money. So the ill-housed will receive a chance to live in decent housing. But at a lower, I repeat, lower cost to the Federal Government than public housing.

Mr. President, this is a program that makes sense. It is economical. It is a private enterprise proposal. It seems to me it is one that will work, and should be approved certainly in the modest amount of $12 million.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment to provide funds for the rent supplement program, primarily because of the timing involved. Due to the Vietnam war, and due to the present inflationary trend, either of which I point out, show no sign of abating, we should not be initiating or experimenting with vast new Federal assistance programs, which are not necessary or of a lower priority nature.

Today, we are being asked to provide several millions of dollars, perhaps ultimately many billions of dollars, for a program whose merit we know little about. At the same time, we are fighting a war in Vietnam and are experiencing inflation here at home. Now is certainly not the time to be experimenting with the hard-earned dollars of the American taxpayer. If anything, we should be looking for many ways to cut back our domestic spending on the national level to help combat inflation. I do not feel it wise, when economy in government is so important, to be asking for vast sums of money to use on a program where there are so many unanswered questions.

I have other reservations regarding the rent supplement proposal—foremost among them, of course, is the fear of stifling the incentive of the individual for homeownership, and the possibility we would be making Government wards of the people involved. If the Government will pay part of the rent of a man, then there will be little incentive for him to work harder to improve his environment by owning his own home.

Not only would this proposal weaken the incentive form homeowuership, but also it may serve as a powerful incentive for a family to discontinue its homeownership and become a renter with Federal subsidy. Mr. President, this would undermine one of the basic principles of America today, that of private homeownership, which has been one of the truly great developments of the past 25 years.

If we accept the principle involved in the rent subsidy program, perhaps we must next expect to accept a Federal program for subsidizing the purchase of clothing, and ultimately a Federal program for a guaranteed annual income, whether a person works or not.

We certainly have an opportunity today to let the American people know that we will not put up with such a program.

I call, therefore, Mr. President, for defeat of this proposal. It is one that would increase domestic spending on an unknown quantity in an already dangerous period of inflation. In addition, it would threaten a great foundation of America, private homeownership in freely associative communities.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, since coming to the Senate, save and except on one occasion, so far as my memory serves me, I have voted for all public housing measures designed for metropolitan centers.

But I have had very close to my heart the needs for legislation to assist people in remote areas, far from the cities of this country, and I am thinking particularly of the Indian, Eskimo, and Alieut people of Alaska.

As the Presiding Officer knows, as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, that subcommittee this morning began hearings on a bill which I had introduced over a year ago, and heard several witnesses from Alaska testify who know the situation in Alaska relative to housing.

Existing Federal laws do not have adequate application to some of the remote areas of Alaska. I suppose that remark could be broadened to include other parts of the country.

In Alaska, as has been stated by the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, some of the Eskimo people and some of the Indian people live in worse situations, worse housing than any slum in any city.

Mr. President, I think that the rent subsidies program is defensible. I voted for it last year. I will say, I had some substantial doubts as to my position earlier this week. But now that the Bankiing and Currency Subcommittee on Housing has taken the matter to which I refer under active consideration, I intend to revert to my original position, and support the rent subsidy program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call to be equally divided on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] to restore an appropriation of $12 million for the rent supplement program.

The essential purpose of rent supplements is to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families. The immediate goal is housing, but the long-range effects will be reflected in reduced crime, lower rates of mental illness, improved educational achievement, improved health and physical fitness and a sense of self-respect among the most disadvantaged and disaffected elements of our society.

It is hard for those of us, who live in recent housing, to understand how substandard housing can sap the human spirit. Substandard housing means more than just a building that is either dilapidated, overcrowded, unheated, vermin infested, without running water or toilet or bath facilities. Usually there is a combination of these factors.

Before we vote on this measure we must ask ourselves whether inadequate housing would affect our self-esteem, our family life, our children's ability to become educated, our physical and mental health? What would be our chances of not succumbing to the temptation of crime either out of frustration or hostility?

Let me outline what the psychological and sociological studies of inadequate housing indicate.

The most obvious effects of inadequate housing upon its inhabitants is, of course, in the area of physical disease. The high rate of infectious illness, the higher rates of infant mortality and the incidence of death can be directly linked to poor housing. One sociologist has established five typical categories of illness associated with inadequate housing:

First. Acute respiratory infections—colds, bronchitis, grippe—related to inadequate heating or ventilation, inadequate and crowded sleeping arrangements.

Second. Certain infectious diseases of childhood—measles, chickenpox, and whooping cough—related to similar causal factors.

Third. Digestive diseases—typhoid, dysentery, diarrhea—related to poor facilities for cold storage of food and to inadequate washing and toilet facilities.

Fourth. Injuries resulting from home accidents related to crowded or inadequate kitchens, poor electrical connections, and poorly lighted and unstable stairs. How many times do we pick up the newspaper and read about a house that burned down in a slum area with three or four children burned to death in it?

Fifth. Infections and noninfectious diseases of the skin related to crowding and inadequate facilities for washing.

Controlled studies, concluded this observer, "confirm that improved housing reduces the incidence of illness and death."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. How much time would the Senator like to have?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may I have an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. But physical illness is not the only illness that is produced by bad housing conditions. What of mental illness? We need not read the case histories to imagine what the stress and insecurity, the unsettledness and anxiety of inadequate, overcrowded housing will do to ones peace of mind. One never really gets used to cockroaches and rats, to insufficient bed room, to the absence of doors between rooms, to a disturbing and disrupting noise level, to being constantly forced to adapt to those immediately about you.

As one psychiatrist has put it, there is a terrific mental strain arising from constantly having to get along with other people. He points out that in the strain of having to adapt constantly to others there is a challenge to the integrity of our personalities. He points out that for any adult this is a tremendous strain, and that "there are children who have never known any other situation."

And what of the children forced to live with the complaints and instability that almost always accompanies inadequate housing? One psychiatrist has listed some of the consequences for the growing child of the overcrowding which accompanies inadequate housing. First, there is a challenge to his sense of individuality because he is so rarely alone and has so little opportunity to look to himself for the real satisfactions of life. Second, there is a challenge to his illusions about other people because he is brought into unavoidable contact with adult weakness and greed. He finds it difficult to build up identifications with hero parents or other ideals.

Such conditions are a kind of quicksand which keep a child from escaping to a better kind of life and home. How will the child in the invironment I have been describing make use of the kind of schooling that will give him the ability to escape from his surroundings? I am not only talking about the fact that poor housing neighborhoods often have poor schools within them, but about study conditions. Where will he go to study? How will he go about his studies? Indeed, why will he feel the need or the urge to study? Who will encourage him? Where will he get his ideal? Certainly not from the adults whose own self esteem has been dealt a severe blow by the mirror image of their surroundings and by a home which is much less a castle than a moat.

And what will be the feelings of the members of such a household toward the society round about them? They will not be the feelings of respect for the society that allows such conditions to exist. They will be hostile feelings, in which right and wrong may seem irrelevant. Indeed, how would one tell those who have no job, no security, no decent home to support the laws of a community which oppresses them?

I might add that the District of Columbia has experimented with rent supplements on a very small scale. Where the families were taken out of the slums,

almost without exception the family was able to raise itself and to improve its condition. The father of the family got a better job. They endeavored to raise themselves to the level or standards in the community in which they resided. The rest of the community did not realize the families in question were being assisted by rent supplements.

I think that this great pioneering and imaginative effort in the field of housing is tremendously important.

I hope the Senate will adopt the very modest amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside without prejudice so that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] may offer an amendment on another section in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have one request of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I wonder if we could arrange for time on that also.

Mr. PASTORE. Not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 22, beginning with the word "That," strike out all through the words "*Provided further,*" on lines 1 and 2 on page 12.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the amendment I have sent to the desk on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] this afternoon does not affect to any extent the changes in the amount of money appropriated to the National Teacher Corps, but it affects the provision which was written in by the House Appropriations Committee requiring that there be a matching formula of 90–10 for the National Teacher Corps.

In February of last year Senator Nelson and I introduced the concept of the National Teacher Corps. It was considered by the Education Subcommittee, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the House committee. It was accepted by these committees and passed by the Congress.

The President also submitted to the Congress a message relative to the Teachers Corps program. The administration had considered the question of having matching funds in the program, and they decided there should not be matching funds for basic and fundamental reasons. The Education Subcommittee in the House of Representatives and the Senate committee considered whether there should be matching funds, and both of them rejected it for a very basic reason. It was the same reason used and considered by the committees in the House of Representatives and the Senate when they considered the elementary and secondary education bill.

It made little sense, on one hand, they felt to give funds to the poorest school districts and then expect them to make some contribution. For that very basic reason we see some $1.5 billion appropriated by Congress and the Senate under title I of the elementary and secondary education bill in a nonmatching fashion. That means that each school district in our country has approximately $40,000.

The idea and the concept of the Teachers Corps is to help and assist the poorest districts.

It was at the request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] that it was written into the Senate report that the Teachers Corps program has a first priority to assist the poorest districts. This was accepted by the Education Subcommittee. This is thec oncept and purpose for which this legislation was introduced and sponsored.

We feel that requiring that there be matching funds runs counter to the idea and purposes for which this program was introduced.

Another point in striking difference is the 90–10 formula. The 90–10 formula has no place in the present legislation. The 90–10 formula that was put in by the House Appropriations Committee dealt with paying teachers' salaries. That is not what this supplemental bill is referring to when it refers to the Teachers Corps. It refers to training teachers and not salaries.

So as a procedural matter, this should not be considered at the present time. If it is to be considered, it should be at a later time when the funds come before Congress on the question of appropriations for teachers' salaries.

I draw the analogy in requesting poor districts of this country to pay for this kind of service to our expecting that disadvantaged countries of the world would use AID money for the Peace Corps. We do not use the matching approach when we gave funds in the secondary and elementary education bill, and we should not in this measure.

This is not only the position assumed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and myself, but also by the National Education Association, which has written to me that the proposal that poor school districts match salaries, even to the extent of 10 percent would be a deterrent to those school districts that we need to help most. Many of them have low salaries.

For these reasons I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendmcnt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. We yielded 5 minutes at the request of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. We have another pending amendment set aside by unanimous consent that is to be voted on at 3:30.

If this further amendment, the pending amendment, is put in, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have to get time by unanimous consent or charge it to one side or the other.

Does the Senator from Illinois make his unanimous-consent request for time on this amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from Illinois will yield to me. we have an agreement here to vote on the $12 million—on the rent subsidy at 3:30.

I have already committed myself to 40 minutes of time on my side, which I will have to restrict somewhat because we have only an hour left and there is equal time on the other side, as well.

If we interpose it with this new amendmcnt there will be 40 minutes that they will be entitled to. That will be 40 minutes taken out of the hour, which leaves 10 minutes to discuss the rent subsidy.

I would hope that I could consult with the distinguished Senator from Illinois to see if we cannot set the pending amendment aside and after 3:30 they can proceed to amend the amendment.

The Senator tells me he needs 2 minutes, but I do not know what is in his hand. I might need 4 hours for rebuttal.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Some of us on the subcommittee dealing with HEW would want, as a matter of record, at least a minute. I never heard of a unanimous-consent agreement to allow the proponents of an amendment 5 minutes and no time for the opponents, somewhere along the line. I do not know what the substitute of the distinguished Senator is, but if it comes down to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts somebody ought to allow us 2 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to withdraw the amendment.

Who yicld time on the pending amendment, which is the $12 million amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was one of those members of the Committee on Appropriations who voted the day before yesterday to delete the $12 million allowed by the House of Representatives for the so-called experimental rent supplement program. In reality, the modest beginning would constitute a little foot in a big door, because, although we would only be appropriating $12 million this year, we would actually be obligating future Congresses to appro-

priate moneys to carry out contract obligations running over the next 40 years. The rent supplement provision, which passed the Senate last year and which I opposed, authorizes appropriations for rent supplements in amounts, ultimately, up to $150 million annually. Thus, although the bill which was before the Senate Appropriations Committee on Monday would have appropriated only $12 million, that very small beginning could grow to $150 million a year, and, whatever the amount appropriated, the law authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to enter into 40-year contracts for rent subsidies.

What appears to be a $12 million appropriation in 1966, in reality is a Trojan horse, in that this Congress will obligate future Congresses over a 40-year period to fund up to $150 million annually in what would likely become a multibillion-dollar program in totality, and I am unwilling to be a party to the so-called experiment.

Moreover, the Secretary of HUD will set maximum limits for admission to rent supplement units in each locality. He will establish in each locality maximum per unit rentals. In short, the Federal Government will, in large measure, set the regulations for construction, determine the rents, and certify persons eligible for rent supplements. The landlord-tenant relationship will be jeopardized.

Individuals who are eligible for rent supplement payments will be required to pay 25 percent of their rent-base income toward the required rent. The difference between the amount paid by the tenant and the fair market rental will be paid monthly as a rent supplement by the Federal Government.

I feel that the Federal Government has a proper role in assisting individuals and communities in acquiring certain basic needs, but there is a limitation not only upon the resources of the Federal Government, but there are also constitutional and practical limitations. When the Federal Government acts in such a way as to destroy the industry of the individual and his incentive to work and to save, the Government is destroying the character of the Nation. I have supported and will continue to support programs which I deem to be reasonable and necessary to help people to help themselves and to assist people who, because of physical or mental incapacities, are unable to provide for themselves, but, in my judgment, the rent subsidy program would start us down a road which has no end and will engage us in a program which will grow to unmanageable proportions. There are many Americans who, from time to time, need assistance in getting on their feet, but this is a program which will make them wards of the Government.

Millions of Americans work and toil and save to provide homes for themselves and their children. Under this so-called experimental rent subsidy program, these same Americans will be taxed to pay the rents of many Americans who have never shown the initiative to prepare for the proverbial "rainy day" and who will become even less interested in doing so when Uncle Sam provides an additional handout.

I support the committee amendment to strike the rent subsidy provision from the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for his untiring efforts on behalf of the rent supplement program.

This program, as it was conceived and proposed by the administration, was a farsighted effort to house low-income people apart from the monotony of public housing and the degradation of the ghetto. Congratulations are due both to the President and to Secretary Weaver for their efforts on its behalf.

Unfortunately, however, the appropriation bill which we are now passing sacrifices many of the best features of the substantive legislation as we enacted it in the Congress last year. First, the $12 million appropriation is entirely inadequate to the housing needs of this country. "A decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" was set as the goal of national policy in the Housing Act of 1949; but up to 40 percent of the people in many of our urban ghettos still live in totally inadequate housing—dirty, rat-infested, without adequate plumbing or heat in the winter. Responding to this need with an appropriation of $12 million only insures that these conditions will continue.

Perhaps more important, this appropriation bill places control over the program in the hands of local officials who have not been able to make progress toward housing desegregation in the past. This limitation is especially unfortunate since no part of the financial support for this program comes from local authorities; it is a private program to which the Federal Government give some assistance.

This limitation was not contained in the substantive legislation. It is my hope that the regular appropriation bill, and appropriations in subsequent years, will not repeat it. I am glad to vote for this bill for the housing which it will make available to those now without adequate housing. But I will continue to work to fund the program adequately, and to remove all inappropriate limitations from its use.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some telegrams I have received bearing on the question now before the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALTANTA, GA.,
April 27, 1966.

Senator GEORGE H. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Private enterprise along with all of our members in your State and throughout the United States are in full support of the administration rent supplement bill now before Senate. We urge your support of this bill as your vote will be a vote for the poor people of the United States.

Q. V. WILLIAMSON,
President, National Association of Real Brokers, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 26, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you support restoration of funds for FHA rent supplement program. Our association sincerely believes this program is far superior to public housing. Will be privately owned, subject to full local taxation and financed in private unsubsidized market. We are convinced that program will be far less costly than publicly owned tax-exempt public housing. FHA rent supplement program deserves change to prove that it is effective device for housing low-income families.

JOHN C. WILLIAMSON,
National Association of Real Estate Boards.

ORLANDO, FLA.,
April 26, 1966.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge your support of funds for FHA rent supplement program. National Association of Real Estate Boards and Florida Realtors believe this program a more effective and less costly device for housing low-income families and will ultimately replace public housing. Program deserves a fair trial.

WALTER B. DECKER,
President,
Florida Association of Realtors.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 26, 1966.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The members of our association request your favorable consideration of the appropriation for the rent supplement program. It is a needed tool in our industry.

JOHN KOELEMIJ,
President, FHBA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 26, 1966.

Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

National Council of Churches, Division of Christian Life and Mission, is deeply disturbed by report Senate committee has dropped appropriation for rent supplement program. Strongly urge your active support on Senate floor for full restoration of this item. We believe rent supplement makes creative use of private initiative in effort to meet housing needs of low-income families in manner which will contribute to their personal growth and strengthen their family lives.

NORMAN J. BEUGHER,
Chairman, Division of Christian Life and Mission, National Council of Churches.
EUGENE CARSON BLAKE,
Chairman, Commission on Religion and Race, Division of Christian Life and Mission, National Council of Churches.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not speak as an opponent of the rent sup-

plement program. I want to make this very clear. It may well be that once the proper legislative action is taken I will be counted among the supporters of the rent supplement program. My interest in voting against the appropriation of funds to start the program at this time is based on the very real worry that if we move ahead now on this supplemental bill, we will be doing a disservice to the rent supplement program.

Appropriations for the rent supplement program have never been considered in hearings before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Both in the last session, and now, the administration brought its proposal to the Congress at a time when it can only be considered by the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I say again that this is not where it belongs. For years all appropriations requests under the various housing acts, and all appropriations for what is now the Department of Housing and Urban Development, have been first considered by the Senators on this side and the Representatives in the other body who are assigned to the Independent Offices Subcommittees. While I, for one, do not claim to be an expert in this field, I at least have shared with the other Senators on the committee years of experience in considering and voting on budget requests for the various housing programs. This observation, about which I feel very strongly, is not meant in any way to reflect on the excellent and hard work done by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals and its members. The senior Senator from Rhode Island has given every consideration to the other members of the subcommittee and to other Senators who are in my position of having a deep interest in various subjects before the committee, but who are not members of that subcommittee. In fact, I think in this instance we have placed too great a burden upon the very capable shoulders of the senior Senator from Rhode Island. Let us, I say to him, take this program under consideration before the subcommittee where it belongs. Let us hold extensive hearings on the rent supplemental program in the Independent Offices Subcommittee. We are scheduled to have the Department of Housing and Urban Development before us on May 17, and we are scheduled to complete our hearings on independent offices on May 25. It is fair to say that there is every chance we shall have a bill before the beginning of next fiscal year.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has requested $35 million for the rent supplemental program for fiscal year 1967. The Secretary of HUD has testified that he would prefer to start the rent supplements as a sizable program. He has testified that the $12 million to start this program, voted by the House, because it is less than the $30 million requested, will "add to the administrative costs in the first place and add to the management costs in the second place, because when you get a lot of small units to manage, this is where the real diseconomies come in. This is why—

And I continue to quote from Dr. Weaver's testimony before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals—

This is why we would try, at the beginning, to have a sizable program.

When asked by Senator PASTORE if $12 million was not too little with which to start this program and was not too little to commence a "reasonable program that would be in the public interest without any unnecessary waste of money," Secretary Weaver answered:

I would certainly feel that it would have to be more than the $12 million and off the top of my head, I would say at least around $20 million to give us the leeway.

Mr. President, we have it here in the hearings—page 451—in the words of the very man who is charged with running this program, that $12 million is not a sufficient amount with which to start this program efficiently and effectively. I really do not believe, therefore, that a vote against commencing this program now is necessarily a vote against the concept of the rent supplement program. To the contrary, I would say to those who wish to strongly support the rent supplement program that a better result will follow if we do not now start with a halfway measure, with much less than full Appropriations Committee support and, I might say, Senate support. The action this Congress takes on the rent supplemental program will have its effect over the short run as we build up the annual levels of activity to over $100 million a year in the next 3 years, and in the long run, when we consider that appropriations action now, whatever the sum may be—$12, $20, or $30 million—will bind each Congress and each Appropriations Committee over the next 40 years at least to appropriate a like sum of money.

I should like to spell this out in a different way, Mr. President. Whatever funds are appropriated by Congress in the 4 years of authorization under the authorizing legislation will have to be met and matched by every succeeding Congress for the next 40 years. Once sums of money are voted for this program, congressional control leaves the program. This is the significance of contract authorizations. The parties with whom the Department of Housing and Urban Development enters into contracts will have a legal call on the funds of the United States for each year up to the amount contracted for. Let us be sure we have built the proper legislative base, prepared the proper law, and that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has perfected the proper regulations before we start this program.

We do not want to get into a situation similar to the one in which we were involved last year. At that time the Senate considered the appropriation bill, and the Department had to recall all of its regulations the night before the matter came up in the Senate.

Think a minute what might have happened if Congress had been stampeded into voting for the rent supplement program in the closing days of the last session. Some of us said then, and we now know, that sufficient and proper planning had not gone into this program, that the loosely drawn regulations were at best unsuitable for such an intricate program, and that instead of helping those who need housing and cannot afford it today, we would have done a disservice to them, by starting an incompletely prepared program, with all of the disastrous effects which come from such action.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield for a short observation on that very point?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator would be interested in knowing that the rules and regulations that were promulgated and withdrawn were drawn at the behest of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals after very exhaustive hearings, and the new rules that have been promulgated have been submitted and gone into in great detail.

The Senator is correct in saying that the rules were withdrawn at that time, but I want him to know that it was the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be the chairman that was responsible for the withdrawal.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad that the Senator was so perspicacious.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not want any credit from the Senator from Colorado, but that is the fact.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it has been said that if we do not vote funds now, we will forever lose the ability to vote whatever amount we wish up to the $30 million authorized for fiscal year 1966. This is not true, as I read the act. I have had confirmation from officials at the Department of Housing and Urban Development that the authorization is cumulative; that is, that the Congress may at any time in the future vote the appropriation of $30 million that is authorized for fiscal year 1966. So, nothing will be lost, ultimately, if we do not vote funds now. The $30 million authorized for fiscal year 1966 could be added to the $35 million authorized for fiscal year 1967, and $65 million could be voted for the next fiscal year, and so on. Let me ask this: If the rent supplement program is successful, and I do not here argue that it cannot be, then what is to keep this Congress from amending the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 sometime before fiscal year 1969 to continue the growth of the program on an annual basis? Do we really delay the program by not voting this $12 million now? Perhaps for a few weeks. Do we reduce the program from the total of $150 million a year, which it is authorized to reach starting July 1, 1968, to $120 million? Not necessarily. Secretary Weaver wants to start the program with a larger amount of funds than the $12 million voted by the House of Representatives. I believe we know that no matter what action is taken here, it is highly unlikely that more than $12 million would be voted now by the Congress. Let us take the administration request before the regular committee where it belongs and if the program has the merits, let us start it this July 1 with

sufficient funds. And, as we gain experience with this program over the next 2 years, let us then consider whether it should be extended, and to what extent. This program may be even more effective than its strongest supporters claim. There is time to let it prove itself. Let us not lose the opportunity to start the program properly by hasty and halfway measures now, which, at the most, will start the administrative machinery rolling about 8 weeks earlier. This program is designed to go on for 40 years at least, and it may go on forever. The Senate should take every opportunity to ascertain that it is properly launched.

I could go on, but I will close with one or two more points.

Both the authorization bill and the appropriation request contain the words "substandard housing," as one of the alternate requisites for beneficiaries under the program. What is "substandard housing?" We know what it is in extreme cases, but should we not develop the legislative record so that it is clear to us and to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and to potential beneficiaries exactly what this term means in tangible form? There are many questions left unanswered on the present legislative record. To take another example, Secretary Weaver was asked how the program would work if a person had no income at all, or no work available to him by which to earn income. The Secretary's answer follows:

> If he had no work available to him, if he were on welfare or relief he might well qualify for this. It would depend upon how much money he had, whether he had enough so that the Government would not have to pay all of his rent, so that he could pay some part of his rent, a reasonable part of it.

Secretary Weaver went on to say that a recipient "has to have enough income so that the one-quarter of his income will be a reasonable amount of the total rent." Now, I find nothing wrong with these statements and I am sure that Secretary Weaver can clarify them, because I think it is important that we know what is meant by a "reasonable amount." Further, Senator COTTON tried to pin this down a little more closely in the hearing. At page 455 of the hearings appears the following question and answer:

> Senator COTTON. But if a particular tenant were allowed to move in by the owners of the tenement and he only received $500 a year, the Federal Government would be obligated to make up all the remaining, up to the rent?
>
> Secretary WEAVER. No. There will be a limit as to what proportion of the rental will be made up by the Government. That will be a maximum. In addition, to that there will be variations. In some instances a tenant will pay 90 percent of the economic rent. In another case 60 percent. Another one 70 percent. Another case, down to 30 and there will be a cutoff.

We can see from these few statements that there will be a maximum percentage of a tenant's rent that the Department of Housing and Urban Development will pay. We see also that it can go as high as 70 percent, but we do not know whether it can go higher, or how high it actually can go.

I believe that it can be as high as 90 percent, according to the statement of the Secretary.

Let me stop here to say that hard and excellent work has been done by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in perfecting their regulations for this program since they came before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals in the last session of Congress. But, I am not sure, and I know this feeling is shared by some other Senators, that all the imperfections in the prior planning, which were so apparent then, have been cleared up. It may be that they have. It may be that extensive hearings and study of this program by the Independent Offices Subcommittees of the two Houses will add little to the legislative record, to clarification of the program, and to its perfection. But I emphasize again, how important I feel it is that the proper and traditional committees be given a chance to consider this program.

One final comment. The House has added a rider which would require, and I quote: "local official approval for participation in this program."

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is adamantly opposed to this rider. He came before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals and opposed this rider but did not offer a substitute or an amendment. He was asked to submit proposals and has submitted various alternate language proposals. These were not considered in the hearing. I understand that the senior Senator from Rhode Island now proposes that the Senate vote for the House funds for the rent supplement program with the rider.

Mr. President, I submit that this important issue which goes to the very essence of this program, if we are to believe that it is the local authorities on whom the success of the failure of this program will finally depend, should not be settled in this fashion. The congressional Independent Offices Subcommittees should have the opportunity to consider the effect of the various proposed language riders affecting local control, and their proposals should be brought before the two Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I repeat that my desire to support the Appropriations Committee which voted upon a rollcall of 15 to 12 to eliminate all funds to commence this program at this time is not founded on total opposition to the rent supplement program. And, I would also emphasize, particularly to those who strongly support this program, that we may well be helping, not hurting it, by delaying its commencement for 8 or 10 weeks so that the proper Appropriations Committees can study it and develop the record before bringing it before this body.

I believe that the Senate should sustain the action the committee took this week and I hope that the Senate will do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand from the Parliamentarian that we have a half-hour remaining before the vote and that the time is about equally divided between the proponents and opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That means that the Senator from Rhode Island is in charge of 15 minutes and the Senator from North Dakota is in charge of 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is equally divided; 16 minutes to the side.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have four or five additional speakers on my side. The reason that I mention this is that I hope they will make their remarks as brief as possible and place in the RECORD anything they desire to put in the RECORD.

At this time I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last year the issue of rent supplements was thoroughly discussed and debated in both Houses of the Congress.

On the Senate side, it was first considered in the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member. As originally presented by the administration, it was designed as a program for lower middle-income groups. In committee, that concept was abandoned and the program was redesigned as an alternative to public housing and to serve the same groups as are eligible for public housing.

It was debated in that form here in the Senate and finally approved by the Senate in that form.

The rent supplement program enlists private enterprise in the task of housing low-income people to a degree never before realized. Projects under the program will be privately initiated, privately financed, privately built, privately owned, and privately managed.

A majority of the Senate was persuaded that this was a program worth trying because, first, it might be a more effective program than public housing, and second, it would be less costly.

The reasons that persuaded us to support this program last year still obtain.

Subsequently, in last year's session, funds to implement the authorization act were requested. These funds were denied. They were denied for the reasons suggested in this language from the conference report:

> Funds for rent supplements are denied at this time without prejudice. Congress has only recently authorized legislation for this program and the new department should have more time to develop sound plans and criteria which can be reviewed when funds are sought early next year.

During the appropriation hearings and in the Senate and House floor debates, it was clear that the Congress expected that the $450,000 provided for administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration would be used for certain preparatory work in connection with the program. The Congress expressed the expectation that in the next session, the executive branch would request appropriations based on firm indications of interest in and need for rent supplement projects.

The Department, in following the expressed intention of Congress, carried out its obligations to discuss proposals with potential sponsors interested in the program, and received preliminary proposals and expressions of interest covering nearly 70,000 units.

The preparatory work, therefore, has been done. The Senate has twice indicated its approval of the program. The amount sought is only 40 percent of that authorized last year. It sems to me, Mr. President, that the time has come to act.

The rent supplement program is designed to assist only low-income families and individuals, and among them only such as belong to one or more of the following, statutory categories—that is, those displaced by governmental action, 62 years of age or older, physically handicapped, living in substandard housing, or living or formerly living in housing destroyed or extensively damaged by natural disaster.

To assure that only low-income people are helped, income limits for eligibility will be established in each community. In no case will these limits be above those established for Federally-aided low-rent public housing in the same community. In addition, allowable asset limitations will be established which are below those generally applied in public housing.

To assure that only housing of modest design is encouraged, maximum mortgage limits will be established in each community which will rule out frills and luxury features. A maximum economic rent level for each size unit will also be established.

This, Mr. President, is a reasonable and modest approach to the housing problems of groups whose housing needs have been our concern since 1937.

It is alternative to public housing which is worth considering.

If it works, it will cost the Government less, and that, too, is a consideration.

The amount of the rent supplement payment that may be made on behalf of a particular family will never be greater than the amount of the subsidy that would be paid for that same family in a public housing unit. As to average costs, it is estimated that the average subsidy cost under rent supplements would run about $40 a month per unit—the level of the subsidy for public housing units currently being built runs about $58 a month per unit.

There are several reasons for the lower subsidy cost in the rent supplement program. Land and construction costs in the rent supplement program would be less than in the public housing program. There will be available to sponsors of rent supplement projects a much wider range of selections of sites, including suburban and outlying land, and generally no clearance would be involved. In addition, certain special construction requirements that add to the cost of public housing would not apply to housing constructed under the rent supplement program.

Under the rent supplement program, the occupant would be required to pay 25 percent of his income for rent compared to the general 20 percent requirement under the public housing program.

These factors alone—lower land and construction costs and greater payments by occupants—will offset the advantages of low-interest rate loans through tax exemptions in the public housing program. In addition, of course, the tax exemption accorded income on bonds issued in the public housing program involves a very substantial loss of revenue to the Treasury and this represents a cost that must be borne by other tax sources. It is estimated that the tax exemption of the income on public housing bonds now costs the Treasury $48 million a year in revenues.

Finally, the local property tax exemption accorded public housing represents a very substantial local contribution and is, also, a part of the economic cost of public housing.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I again wish to identify myself with those who have spoken in opposition to the committee amendment, which I hope will be rejected.

Mr. President, I am in a sense a big city Senator. I believe, Mr. President, that this is a critically important program for the big cities, and, more than that, the big cities are watching what we do in this program, as a symbol of what we intend to do in respect to the major crisis now confronting them.

The President has called this new rent supplement program an effort to really improve the American cities. It ties directly into the demonstration cities program. It is the first real alternative to public housing in 30 years.

But what is more important than anything else, Mr. President, is that it represents an earnest showing of good faith on the part of Congress that we really intend to try to do something about the problems of the poor city dwellers.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive of a situation in which, in an agricultural bill, we would do quite so much soul searching as is evidenced here about any such item as this, because we are accustomed to spending billions for agriculture. This is for the advantage of the cities; and we had better become accustomed to giving them a hand, lest they do something about it themselves which may not be nearly as pleasant, efficient, or economical.

Finally, Mr. President, $12 million is just about the rock bottom sum which will give us some semblance of a program. The record now shows the need for at least 97,000 units, of which this sum will supply only 20,000. I say to my fellow Senators, this is the time to show evidence of our good faith. If we do not, I fear the time will come when we will rue the day that we did not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I support the action of the Appropriations Committee which voted by rollcall to eliminate funds to commence the rent supplement program during this fiscal year. I do not believe that the supporters of the rent supplement program can claim that very much has been lost by the action of the committee. In the first place it is not realistic to suppose that we could vote funds above the $12 million voted by the House and sustain it in conference. Second, Secretary Weaver stated in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals that $12 million was inadequate to properly commence this program, and we do not know what amount will be adequate. Third, the Independent Offices Subcommittee will be conducting hearings all during the month of May and at that time the Department of Housing and Urban Development will have ample opportunity to testify on this program. As of this moment they have requested the appropriation for contract authorization for the full $35 million authorized in the House bill for fiscal year 1967. According to legal counsel they could amend and request to add $30 million additional if no funds are voted now for fiscal year 1966.

I agree with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is ranking minority member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that it is in that committee where the hearings should be conducted, where the legislative record should be made, and where the action on this proposal should be initially taken. I believe that Senator ALLOTT has raised sufficient questions concerning how this program will work; questions concerning the definition of "substandard" housing and questions concerning what proportion a tenant will be required to pay of the total rent due each month, and there are other questions that can well be brought out in a hearing before the Independent Offices Subcommittee. The question before us now is not a $12 million question—it is a $150 million question per year for 40 or more years to come or a total cost if fully implemented of $6 billion. It is a question of properly launching a very intricate and very new program. I do not believe that this program should be launched without ever having hearings before the proper appropriations subcommittee. I do not believe that those that would vote to restore $12 million to this bill can claim that all is lost or in fact that very much of anything is lost if there is an 8-week delay in launching the rent supplement program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair what the time situation is at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 22 minutes remaining. Each side has 11 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, it is as follows:

The House passed on appropriation, or more precisely contract authority, of $12 million for the rent supplements program, and attached a rider to it. The Senate Appropriations Committee adopted an amendment eliminating the entire provision. The question now before us is, shall we agree to the committee amendment; namely, shall we approve the killing of this measure?

I hope that we will all vote no, and try to save the little that is now in the bill. I had hoped that we could approve $30 million, which would have provided for about 50,000 families. If we are successful in defeating the pending question, we will have only $12 million, which will provide for no more than 20,000 families

This program of private housing built by private industry for nonprofit sponsors is the most important legislative tool we have for providing housing for low-income families in communities which heretofore they have not been able to afford.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development already has received from churches and other nonprofit sponsors applications for housing for 100,000 families, 5 times the amount that would be made possible by the meager $12 million for which we are fighting. These applications for 561 proposed housing projects have come from 342 localities, in all 50 States. In Illinois, up to March 8, 1966, 18 projects were proposed in 8 localities which would provide housing for 3,786 families.

This program, enacted in the Housing Act of last year, is our best new hope to provide adequate housing for the poor. In 1949 the Congress and the Federal Government pledged itself to secure decent housing for every American. Our efforts under public housing projects have simply not met the problem. We have barely managed to stay even.

There are still 8½ million families who live in dilapidated housing while less than 600,000 units of public housing have been constructed since 1949.

STRONG INTEREST FROM SPONSORS

The interest expressed by the eligible sponsor organizations in rent supplements is very strong. As Senators know, the sponsors of rent supplement housing must be private nonprofit organizations, limited dividend mortgagors, or cooperative housing corporations. I have already pointed out that such groups, as of March 8, 1966, have expressed interest in sponsoring 561 projects, which would provide units to house 97,983 families. These expressions of interest have already come from 342 different localities in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The $30 million in contract authority requested by the President for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1966 would provide 50,000 units of rent supplements. In other words, it would provide housing for 50,000 families. This is only one-half the number of units for which sponsors have already expressed an interest.

The pending question, since it would only restore $12 million of the President's request, as appropriated by the House, would only provide about 20,000 units or one-fifth of the number for which the Department has already had strong expressions of interest and intent. I submit that this is a very modest restoration of contract authority and that it should trouble our consciences that the circumstances restrict our efforts to such a minimum contribution to the housing of our poor. The fact is, however, that the strong opposition to this which developed in the House and the action of the Appropriations Committee has led us to the judgment that it would be feasible at this stage to seek only the $12 million appropriated by the House.

FULL $30 MILLION IS NEEDED

I personally would like to see the full amount requested by the President included in the bill, and I so testified before the Appropriations Committee on March 31. But I am willing to join with the other Senators in asking for what it is practicable to get at this stage. The regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 1967 will be coming forward soon, and I intend to exert every effort that one Senator can to encourage the appropriation of the full $35 million in contract authority requested in the President's budget.

SUPPLEMENTS LIMITED TO THE POOR

Some of the opposition to this appropriation last year was based on a misunderstanding that the rent supplements might not be limited solely to the poor. I think that this has been entirely cleared up. Secretary Weaver has testified that this will be carefully controlled.

In order to be eligible a family must meet an absolute limitation on assets, regardless of where the family lives, of $2,000. For an elderly citizen, whose old-age needs are greater, the asset limitation will be $5,000. Assets include cash and automobile, but not furniture or clothing, which are about the only two types of assets, according to the Secretary that are not included in making this determination. Further, the rent supplement housing applicant would have to meet the local income limitation for eligibility for public housing. For example, in Chicago a family of four would not be eligible at all if its income was greater than $4,600. In Tulsa, Okla., the limit would be $3,000 for a family of four. And in Clinton, Tenn,. it would be $3,500. These are, I repeat, the income limits under public housing now in effect.

MUST ALSO BE DISPLACED, AGED, HANDICAPPED, VICTIMS OF NATURAL DISASTER

There may be some misunderstanding of how the program would work, but I think by now everyone understands that it is for the poor, and just being poor is not in fact sufficient evidence for eligibility. In addition to meeting the standards I have just mentioned, the rent supplement family must also belong to at least one of the five following categories: They must be first displaced by Government action; second, 62 years of age or older; third, physically handicapped; fourth, living in substandard housing; or, fifth, living or formerly living in housing destroyed or extensively damaged by natural disaster.

If the family meets such standards and the private nonprofit builder of a rent supplement unit would rent to the family, then the Federal Government would make up the difference between 25 percent of the family's income and the market rental value of the unit. For example, if the family income is $240 per month and the full rent on the living unit is $110, the family would be required to pay 25 percent of income or $60 toward the rent. The Federal Government would pay directly to the nonprofit sponsor the difference, or $50. But there are additional checks to see that this program remains one for the poor. Each year the resident must recertify his income. If his income has increased, the amount of the rent supplement would be reduced accordingly. Likewise, if there is a loss of income, the family can apply for an increase in the supplement and may receive it but only if the increase can be afforded within the ceiling fixed within the contract.

There is some additional misunderstanding that these supplements would be provided to any existing dwelling units available. That, of course, is not the case. While there is provision for using rehabilitated housing under the rent supplement program, almost all of the expressions of interest which the Department has received have been for new housing units to be constructed by the nonprofit sponsors.

RIDER IS UNWISE LEGISLATION IN AN APPROPRIATION BILL

An additional element to the pending question, of course, is that its defeat would also restore the rider attached by the House Appropriations Subcommittee, which would apparently require that rent supplement units be either a part of a workable program under the housing laws or have local official approval.

I strongly opposed that rider before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I think it is based upon a misunderstanding that these units would otherwise not have been constructed in accordance with local zoning and building ordinances. Of course they would have to be constructed in accordance with local law.

But it needs to be clearly understood that this is not a public housing program of direct grants of Federal money to localities which would be matched by local public funds. In fact, not one penny of local public funds is involved in this program. Units are to be sponsored by local nonprofit organizations, and they are to be built by private builders. We do not require that private builders seek the approval of local authority, other than living up to zoning and housing codes, to offer FHA subsidized financing. It is against all sound parliamentary procedure to have such legislation inserted in an appropriations bill which may hamstring this proposal, which a number of Senators and I have called "an FHA for the poor."

I hope very much that we will defeat the committee amendment which would eliminate any provision for rent subsidies, so that we will thereby affirm our support for at least this minimum program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, I should like to suggest to him a 2-minute rollcall, with 1 minute to be deducted from the time of each side.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is agreeable.

Mr. PASTORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the rollcall, not to exceed 2 minutes, to be divided equally between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand that the 2 minutes allowed for the quorum call have now expired, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on March 29, 12 Senators isused a statement expressing their opposition to the rider to the rent supplemental program attached by the House to the supplemental appropriation bill, and to the reduction in the amount which had been asked for by the administration.

Because of the limitation of time, I believe the best way to summarize my reasons for voting against the committee amendment is to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement issued by the 12 Senators.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS URGE UNCONDITIONAL FUNDING OF RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM, MARCH 29, 1966

(A joint statement in opposition to the rider on the rent supplement program attached by the House to the supplemental appropriations bill)

We strongly oppose the legislative rider to the appropriation for the rent supplement program adopted by the House. We believe that this rider, which creates a local veto over the location of privately built rent supplement units, would render the program unworkable and effectively destroy it.

We also regret that the House failed to appropriate the full $30 million which the President requested.

Of the two matters, the local veto rider is by far the more grave. It would provide that no part of the appropriation may be used in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either a part of a "workable program" established for urban renewal purposes, or which is without local official approval for participation in the program.

We strenuously object to these limitations for the following reasons:

1. Not one penny of local public funds is involved in this program. There is no requirement that priavte builders seek the approval of local authorities in order to offer FHA subsidized financing. We can see no reason why private builders should be forced to obtain local approval for rent supplement projects, which are in essence an "FHA for the poor."

2. Most communities do not have "workable programs." In these communities the burden would be on the private developer to secure the approval of local officials for the site location for each individual rent supplement dwelling unit. We believe that in most cases this burden would be so great as to discourage the private enterprise initiatives which are essential for the success of the program. Rent supplements were designed to give private enterprise a chance to house low-income families. We do not believe the Congress should take away that chance before American industry has had the opportunity to use it.

3. A major objective of the rent supplement program, as adopted by the Congress in the Housing Act of 1965, was to permit the dispersal of decent low-income housing throughout an entire community through the free choice of individual developers and nonprofit and limited-profit associations. If it is adequately and unconditionally funded, it will help hundreds of thousands of families who have been caught in the helpless chain of poverty and ignorance to raise their children in an environment of decency and opportunity. The local veto rider, if it should become law, will be used to confine rent supplement housing to the areas in which the families entitled to rent supplements already live, thus frustrating the clear intent of the Congress. The problems of our cities will never be resolved if we establish walls or immovable curtains beyond which the poor and elderly cannot go to find decent housing.

4. The Committees on Banking and Currency of the House and Senate, and the House and Senate themselves, carefully considered the rent supplement proposal. The Congress established legislative authority and applicable conditions in the Housing Act. The House now has legislated revision of an act of Congress in an appropriations bill. This is a violation of all sound legislative procedure and the Senate should not permit this violation to stand.

We therefore urge that the Senate strike the local veto rider from the language of the appropriation bill. In addition, we hope that the entire $30 million requested for the program will be appropriated.

This statement is signed by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE of New Jersey, Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK of Pennsylvania, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS of Illinois, Senator PHILIP A. HART of Michigan, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of New York, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York, Senator WALTER F. MONDALE of Minnesota, Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine, Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin, Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER of Oregon, Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS of Maryland, and Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., of New Jersey.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, for yielding me this time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am waiting for the distinguished Senator from the great State of Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to come into the Chamber to speak against the committee action which deleted the $12 million.

Earlier in the afternoon, he told me that he desired to speak on the amendment and that he would be willing to do it just before the vote.

I merely wish to say to Senators that this is—to use the venacular—an old chestnut. I do not believe that there is a Senator in this Chamber who does not understand what this is all about. I believe that if we look down deep into our hearts, and examine our consciences, we will reach the conclusion that this is actually a philosophical outlook. There are people who sincerely believe that we should not undertake this kind of program. For their point of view I have the deepest and highest respect.

On the other hand, there are many other people who feel that we have now reached the point in our society where, as President Kennedy once said, "If a free society cannot take care of the many who are poor, how can it save the few who are rich?"

Much has been said about what the income of an eligible person might be in this program. No one can come in under this program unless he is eligible for public housing. Public housing, my dear friends, is for the poor. Beyond that, there are the other five categories I have mentioned which must be complied with before any person can be considered eligible under the program.

However, always remember this: No matter what the situation might be, the individual must pay one-quarter of his monthly income toward the rent himself, which means that, in any event, if a person makes $100 a week he himself must pay $100 a month toward the rent. Then, beyond that, of course, depending upon the size of the family and the accommodations necessary, the Government comes in and subsidizes the rest.

I realize that there are many people who feel we should not undertake this kind of program, but let me say to all Senators, especially those on this side of the aisle, that this is Lyndon Johnson's program.

I never knew Lyndon Johnson to be a starry-eyed dreamer. I never knew Lyndon Johnson to be a man who would want to waste the taxpayers' money. I have sat in this Chamber year after year while he sat in this very seat which I have the honor to occupy this afternoon, and if anyone has measured the dollar bill and rubbed two nickels together more closely than Lyndon Johnson has, find that man and I will shake his hand.

Mr. President, this is a poor man's program. That is what Senators are about to vote upon this afternoon.

The argument has been made that we have not investigated the problem enough. Well, I defy any man in the Senate to stand up and tell me that I did not give this particular item all the consideration and study that it needed. I attended every single meeting which was held. I invited every member of the committee to come to the meeting, and we went through the whole subject from top to bottom, north to south, east to west. I come before the Senate this afternoon to emphasize that this is a program for the poor.

I know that many Senators could not take the $20 million. I can understand that. The fact is, I urged strongly that

the proponent of the amendment not pursue it. I thought what we should do, at best, this afternoon would be to give endorsement to the program. The amount is not important. The program itself is important—very important.

I ask Senators to override the action of the committee and to vote "nay" on this particular amendment and bring it back where the House put it—meaning the $12 million.

I appeal to Senators who could not take the $20 million. I understand why they could not. But do not let that affect the $12 million. That is the figure that was given by the House, and I hope that the Senate will sustain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator in charge of time for the opposition, yield me 5 minutes so that I may grant that time to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who will make a very brilliant—and I emphasize and repeat, very brilliant—explanation of this proposed legislation and what it means?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, with the understanding that it will be a brilliant speech, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is granted 5 minutes additional time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and it will be a brilliant speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I want to thank my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, and let me say that I have been in the Senate now for almost 30 years and one of the first chores I undertook when I came here was to foster the public housing program. I am proud of the fact that I have supported every housing act since 1937.

I worked hard in support of the Housing Act of 1937, a measure which created the U.S. Housing Authority. I have been a leading advocate of minimum housing standards for the poor of this Nation ever since.

Mr. President, in the earlier years it was quite a task. The way by which we were able, on this side of the aisle, to have the program adopted, was to enlist the support of the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio. We worked on that program for many years before it was finally implemented by the House and Senate.

Mr. President, the existing public housing program provides for the creation of a housing authority in a State and that authority then proceeds to construct public housing with a subsidy paid by the Federal Government. The annual subsidy today for public housing amounts to approximately $210 million a year. The objections lodged by the opponents of the bill were that it would put the Government into the housebuilding business.

This new method, therefore, which is being proposed, would leave to private enterprise the right to construct housing for the poor and the subsidy payments to those who would construct these buildings would be paid in a similar manner and along the same lines as is presently provided in the Public Housing Act.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say this, that the amount to be paid by the users of the proposed housing units will be 25 percent of their family income in order to be eligible, whereas, under the Public Housing Act, they pay but 20 percent. In other words, to be eligible, a family must spend 25 percent of its income for housing before the supplement could be paid and then only to bring it up to minimum standard.

This is really and truly, as I see it, a continuation of the public housing program, with the accent on the construction of the buildings by private enterprise rather than by a housing authority created by the State.

Mr. President, that is all it is. I am hopeful that this program can be given a trial. The subsidy would be paid on new housing to be constructed or on housing in which there is a substantial repair job on existing housing.

Mr. President, I would emphasize that as to this program, the recipients of this rental must pay at least 25 percent of their income instead of 20 percent now provided for in the Public Housing Act. It encourages the recipient to help himself and his family. I firmly believe that this new program will inure to the benefit, not only of the poor of this Nation, but to their employers as well. A man who has a clean decent place to live and rear his family can be more productive in society. He can go to his work each day rested and prepared both physically and emotionally for the day's task. His children can gain more from their schoolwork if they arrive at the school each day after a good night's rest in a clean and uncrowded home. Mr. President, the benefits that can be realized by this program are almost unlimited.

This bill, Mr. President, would have the advantage of leaving on the tax rolls of the cities and counties, the rental property.

As Senators well know, public housing is not subject to property tax.

I hope, Mr. President, that this program will be given a trial. I know that if it is administered correctly, it will do great good to the poor people of this Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield 3 minutes, or the remainder of the time, to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have only one or two remarks to make in the concluding moments of the debate concerning this particular matter. My own respect for the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, of course, is very great, and I know of his longtime interest in public housing. But I would not want the misconception to prevail here that this is in any way a substitute for public housing.

The public housing expenditure will continue, as they have gone on before, and so the $150 million maximum, as it now stands, which we would devote to this program would be in addition to the other program, and as has been explained previously will continue for some 40 years.

There is no way for Congress under this so-called contractual authority that is contained in this authorization and appropriation to avoid those subsequent appropriations because they constitute and will constitute a legal claim against the Government.

I pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman. He still feels we are attacking him, but we are not attacking him at all.

I wish to reread one section of the Secretary's testimony before our committee. If there is anything that demonstrates adequately that we do have to go back to them and make them pin down their regulations and intentions, it is this.

Senator COTTON asked the Secretary:

Senator COTTON. But if a particular tenant were allowed to move in by the owners of the tenement and he only received $500 a year, the Federal Government would be obligated to make up all the remaining, up to the rent?

Secretary WEAVER. No. There will be a limit as to what proportion of the rental will be made up by the Government. That will be a maximum. In addition, to that there will be variations. In some instances a tenant will pay 90 percent of the economic rent. In another case 60 percent. Another one 70 percent. Another case, down to 30 and there will be a cutoff.

What is the maximum? What is the minimum? Is it 90 percent? Is it 30 percent? Or is there no maximum and is there no minimum?

It is exactly questions such as this which have arisen and have prompted me to uphold the action of the committee, which voted on a record vote 15 to 12 to strike the $12 million House item from the bill.

I hope that when we vote the Senate will vote to sustain the action of the majority of the Appropriations Committee and not to uphold the figure of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORTON. The first point which the Senator made so eloquently was that this does not in itself reduce what we are required to do in the public housing area.

Mr. ALLOTT. It in no way replaces the public housing bill.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator. I think this would have merit if it replaced the public housing bill, but this is indeed a new program.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is entirely new and the Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MORTON. The position many of us have taken, regardless of the merit, is based on the fiscal position in which we find ourselves today with the strain on the Treasury and rampant inflation. This is not the time to endorse new pro-

grams, no matter how meritorious they may be.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct. In addition, I believe this matter should come before that committee, for it has never come before the Independent Offices Subcommittee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 3:30 having arrived, and the yeas and and nays having been ordered on the pending committee amendment, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a "yea" vote means no money and a "nay" vote means $12 million, as voted for by the House of Representatives. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A "yea" vote supports the position of the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. It means no money.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. METCALF (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If she were present, she would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut, [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent because of death in his immediate family and is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Allott	Fong	Mundt
Bennett	Gore	Murphy
Boggs	Hartke	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Robertson
Cannon	Holland	Russell, Ga.
Carlson	Hruska	Simpson
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Curtis	Kuchel	Talmadge
Dirksen	Lausche	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Morton	Young, Ohio

NAYS—46

Aiken	Jackson	Muskie
Anderson	Javits	Nelson
Bartlett	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Bass	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Bayh	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Brewster	Long, La.	Randolph
Burdick	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Case	Mansfield	Scott
Church	McCarthy	Smathers
Clark	McGee	Smith
Douglas	McGovern	Sparkman
Ellender	Mondale	Tydings
Fulbright	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Montoya	Yarborough
Hart	Morse	
Inouye	Moss	

NOT VOTING—9

Bible	Hayden	Neuberger
Dodd	McNamara	Russell, S.C.
Gruening	Metcalf	Saltonstall

So the committee amendment, to strike out lines 1 through 17 on page 5, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, the manager of the bill, about the language under the caption "National Teachers Corps," at the bottom of page 11 of the bill. A proviso under this item reads:

Provided, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teachers Corps.

I wonder if I am mistaken in my understanding that none of this money is to be used for the payment of salaries in the National Teachers Corps.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct. This language was written into the bill by the House. It is a legislative admonition as to what Congress feels the program should be—a 90–10 ratio.

It does not apply to this provision. As a matter of fact, of the $9.5 million, $7.2 million is for training of teachers. The remainder of the money is for administrative money and travel expenses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wonder if I further understand that this entire program is for the selection and training and the enrollment of teachers.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wonder if this language appearing here is going to apply from on.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, we cannot hear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senate be in order? Senators who are conversing will please cease their conversing or go to the cloakroom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the administration is going to train these teachers and enroll them, who knows to what extent this program will balloon? Who knows whether from now on we are going to pay for this by taking 90 percent out of the Federal till and 10 percent out of the State funds?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not understand whether the House wrote that provision in. I do not understand why it is in there if none of these funds are to be used for the payment of teachers' salaries.

Mr. PASTORE. I answer that question very simply. The administration's plan was for 100-percent Federal money. That is the way it was presented to the House committee.

The committee did not go along with that. They felt that there should be local participation. Therefore the committee wrote in the proviso that no more than 90 percent can be Federal money and that 10 percent would have to be put up by the local authority in participation, as in the case of the interstate roads program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island take the position that this is going to be permanent legislation and that, no matter how many teachers we select and train, 90 percent of the expense will be paid by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the State government from now on?

Mr. PASTORE. Depending upon the money that Congress will appropriate from year to year. But in the appropriation of this money, if this proviso remains as a legislative fiat, then in no case can the money that we appropriate—that we have a right to decide upon every single year—be used beyond 90 percent of what the allowance might be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then this is a permanent piece of legislation.

Mr. PASTORE. This is, I would say, a permanent piece of legislation, yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, strike out beginning in line 20 through line 6, page 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For the National Teacher Corps for the purposes authorized in section 513(a) (1) and (2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $9,500,000, to recruit, select and enroll teachers in the Teacher Corps for training in accordance with the terms of the Act: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 50 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this differs from the text of the bill only in that it is a little more precise in reference to the Higher Education Act and the provisions therein.

I let the amount of money stand, but I change the formula from 90–10 to 50–50 because the States will get the benefit, and I think they ought to pay half of the cost, since the distinguished Senator

from Rhode Island states that this has the effect of permanent legislation.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient number? There is a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I hope sincerely that the Senate will reject the amendment.

I realize the sincerity and the purpose of my distinguished colleague, the minority leader. However, we must realize what the Teachers Corps is. It is a group of teachers which will be trained and sent to localities that are very poor, substandard in education, localities which in many instances cannot do the things that must be done to give the quality of education that the remainder of us are able to enjoy.

The moment that we place this on a 50–50 basis, we cut down and cut out those whom we seek to help, the poor municipalities. That is the reason why President Johnson suggested that it be 100 percent.

The House in its own good conscience and judgment made it a 90–10 formula, but if we make this a 50–50 formula, the one thing that concerns and disturbs the Senator from Rhode Island is that we may be sounding the death knell of the whole philosophy and purpose of this program.

I say to my distinguished colleagues: Let us try this. We can always change the formula. Let us see how the formula works. Let us see what localities it reaches. Let us discover the places that cannot obtain teachers because they cannot afford to pay enough, or the places that are not attractive enough for educated people to go.

That is the reason for this program. I think we would be doing a great injustice to the program otherwise.

I know it sounds good to say that we are cutting out 40 percent of the responsibility of the Federal Government. That argument has some purpose and that argument has tremendous weight. However, we must realize what this program is. If we change this formula to the extent that has been suggested by my distinguished colleague, I am afraid that we will do irreparable harm to the whole program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a short while ago the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] offered an amendment to make this 100 percent. He proposed that the Federal Government should pay the whole freight.

We have been pursuing that course for too long, and we are piling up commitments and appropriations that only serve financially to aggravate the inflationary fever that is in the country.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not yet. We have already approved a pay bill for $290 million, life insurance for $88 million, GI's for $255 million. I understand that the other House approved $41 million additional for impacted schools and $401 million was approved over there on yesterday for agricultural research, ACP payments and REA.

They now come along with $390 million for military pay, $218 million for Nike X, $23 million for the Coast Guard, $11 million additional for the Air Museum, $11 million additional for the airlift, $600 million for HEW; then, who knows what will happen so far as Vietnam is concerned?

We have taken a position on the minority side that there are two ways to check this fever that is giving concern to the President of the United States. And I want to help him if I can, without putting all these burdens upon the Federal Treasury.

Somewhere we will have to build a Berlin wall and say: "Thus far and no further."

The President has scolded the businessmen at the White House concerning capital expenditure. I spent 1½ hours with him the other evening and he told me the whole story. He has admonished the housewives of the country not only to be frugal, but also to walk into the grocery store and say to the proprietor: "How come the high prices?"

There ought to be a directive of the President of the United States to the Senate and to the House saying that it is time to put a cap sheet on these expenditures.

We have been trying in a small way to get this done. One will not find the fault on this side of the aisle either in the Senate or the House. The motions to cut and the motions to recommit have been made, but due to the imbalance from the 1964 elections the vote is on the Democratic side and the vote today will be on the Democratic side, 2 to 1.

If we want to help the President, let us start now and let us relieve the Treasury of some of this burden. This is the place in which the States can pick up 50 percent of the tab.

This program will not stop at this limit. The sky will be the limit before we get through.

Mr. President, I am going to raise my feeble voice on this floor on every occasion I can in order to give emphasis to the need for economy.

It reminds me of the man and wife who went to buy one of these little economy sized foreign cars and the lady in the family said: "Why, that costs almost as much as a big car." And the salesman said: "Well, if you want economy, you have got to pay for it."

It looks as though that is what we must do. I am going to speak my piece. The Senator may vote as he chooses on this, but I want to see that a part of this burden is lifted from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, no one on this floor has more respect for the judgment, the sincerity, and the honesty of purpose of my good colleague, the minority leader. However, by the same token, if we are to argue the matter logically, why not provide for 100 percent to be paid by the States and leave the Federal Government out of it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am willing; I am willing.

Mr. PASTORE. I know the Senator is willing, but he is not suggesting that in his amendment at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am trying to be gracious and temperate.

Mr. PASTORE. I know that and I appreciate it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know that the Senator does.

Mr. PASTORE. I appreciate it immensely.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can see it in the eyes of the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely. When I turn my face I believe that the Senator can see my beam as well. However, the fact remains that we must measure this in terms of what we are trying to do and in terms of the existing needs. I believe this is the best asset we can develop in this country. Long after Vietnam is reposed in the recess of ancient history, we will still have the poor with us. We will still have those who have not had an opportunity for equal opportunity.

Many places in this country today are a scandal on the conscience of the United States of America. When we realize that in this land of ours one-fifth of our population lives on the edge of poverty, we begin to wonder why this is so. We are the one nation in the world that has more air-conditioned Cadillacs than can be found in the rest of the world. We have two cars in every family, a radio on every floor, and a television in every bedroom, and yet we have thousands and thousands of people in the United States of America who tonight are going to bed hungry.

This is the great paradox of our day and age. Here we are, the most affluent society in the world. We have one-sixth of the world's population. We occupy 7 percent of the landmass of the world. We have 40 percent of the wealth of the world—and we have the poor with us. One out of every four persons in the United States of America is poor.

Now, what are we trying to do? Many changes have taken place, yes, by edict of the Supreme Court. Now we are looking around to give a better opportunity—to whom? To our own.

We can spend billions and billions of dollars—and I agree—to help give freedom to the people of South Vietnam. But I say, today let us not be so parsimonious that we cannot give a nickel to our own.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, frankly, I am wondering what this has to do with food in Vietnam. I thought this was a teacher training and enrollment program. I do not propose that we go out and eat the teachers.

What I am concerned about here is that, as we go along and indoctrinate more and more teachers, and the number grows—and the manager of the bill has said this is permanent—whether we have 5,000, 10,000, or 100,000, Uncle Sam pays 90 percent of the bill.

Where are the States? The burden will be there. I see that burden, and I wish to see it put in proper perspective. If it would make my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, any happier, I could modify it and make it 10 percent out of the Federal till and 90 percent from the States. I thought I was tolerant. I thought I was forbearing in the matter. I thought I was reasonable. I was going to make it 50–50, like the fellow who sold those rabbit sandwiches, one rabbit to one horse.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know that I have the floor, but if I do, I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe I have the floor, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, the Senator from Illinois has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yielded to the Senator from Massachusetts. If he wishes, I will yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, and then to him.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Fine. Perfectly agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I have been listening to the discussion about financing the training of candidates for the Teachers Corps. I should like to ask a question about the operation of the Teachers Corps itself.

There are many persons throughout the country who do not accept or welcome the idea of a Teachers Corps established by the Federal Government, employing teachers selected by the Federal Government, paid by the Federal Government, going into school districts all over the country—districts where normally and traditionally teachers are chosen by the local school authorities.

I know this deals with the authority contained in the Higher Education Act of 1965, but I should like to direct to members of the committee, who are well acquainted with those provisions, a question about how the Teachers Corps would be operated. Who selects the teachers; who determines what school districts they will go into?

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. Do the local school districts have any authority to approve or reject the use of these teachers in their districts?

I live in an area where there are hundreds of school districts which need teachers, and which need every advantage of education that can come their way. I have known that all my life.

But throughout my years in the Senate, we have emphasized, insisted upon and honored local control of education and the control of teaching by the local school district. Today we have been talking about whether we will appropriate $9.5 million, and whether State matching will be 10 or 50 percent of the total. I say there is a more substantial question involved, and that is the premise upon which this whole program is based.

I know it could do good; I understand that. But what if it grows into some giant organization, with teachers selected by someone over in the U.S. Office of Education, who will then be sent into school districts all over this country, whether the local people want them or not?

Even though they might do some good, I think the concept itself requires close examination before we vote on funds to begin operation of such a program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us get an answer right now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the floor. I wish to refer the question to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is a member of the committee and who has asked that question.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I asked the Commissioner. His answer was, "You call Washington and get the teachers. You bypass the State."

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield to me? I was at that same meeting. I have not had to see a doctor because of my hearing; I think I can hear very well.

But as a matter of fact, you do not even have to hear at all. All you have to do is read the law. It is right in the law, where it says you have got to get the permission of the State to begin with. It is right in the law. You cannot go into a State unless the State permits you in.

Unless the State puts up its 10 percent of the money, how can you go in? It is up to the States to decide. The sovereignty of the State is absolutely protected, right in the language of the provision.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Good. Then let us recognize the sovereignty of the States, and let them pay half the bill, 50–50.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield, and let me respond to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to make one observation, then I shall sit down.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, do not do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I am getting tired.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator should yield, however, so that we can answer the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Dakota. The confusion started because time is controlled.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe, let me indoctrinate the teachers and send them out from Washington, and I will control every school in the 50 States of the Union, what they teach and how they teach it. Then you will have control with a capital C, and you will find that it has sneaked in through the back door.

That is it. The Senate can vote on my amendment, and vote it up or down. But the case has to be made.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and I introduced this concept of the Teacher Corps in February of last year.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order, please? I think we all should hear this.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator withhold until order is restored? The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, we had long and considerable deliberations. We had long hearings with the Senate Education Committee. We met with the NEA. We considered this in debate on the floor of the Senate.

The proposal that the distinguished Senator from Illinois has talked about this afternoon is not, Mr. President, the Teacher Corps which is written into this legislation. It is not, nor does it deal with the amendment which I suggested some time before the rental subsidy vote came up today. It is a complete distortion of what is in the bill, and of the purposes of the amendment.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has talked about local control. All he has to do is refer to section 516 of the Higher Education Act, which outlines in detail, right in the legislation—not what we say, Mr. President, not what any Member of the Senate says, but right in the legislation—the preservation of local control.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois talks about participation of the States, that since they are participating in these programs, therefore they ought to pay half.

Mr. President, this legislation is directed toward the local school district, the local school area which has these problems, not toward the State. And, Mr. President, the procedures which have been outlined and considered by the committe, talked about here, and considered in the House committee, and which were the subject of the message of the President of the United States, are extremely clear. The initiative comes from the local school community. The local school board makes an application, and, under the amendments which have been made in this legislation, it has to be with the approval of the State board. It comes to the Commissioner of Education, and then, and only then, will the Commissioner of Education act.

It is detailed specifically how he can act, that is all detailed in the bill.

But, Mr. President, no Commissioner of Education can send any teacher into any school district in this country without the approval of the local school district or the local school board.

Mr. President, the idea of title I of the primary and secondary education bill was that there was a need in this country. We did not have title I to say that the various school districts are going to have to match 10 percent from their local school resources. The $1.5 billion that was appropriated under title I comes to $40,000 per school district, and there has been wide latitude provided as to what will be done with the funds under title I. It can go for shoes for schoolchildren,

for teaching materials, for various other things, or for teachers' salaries.

What we are trying to do, Mr. President, is direct the program where there is the most critical need. I must say that the suggestion which was made by my distinguished fellow Senator from the opposite side of the aisle, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the idea, which was unanimously accepted and received by the members of the committee, and put into the report. that the Commissioner of Education is instructed that these programs go into the poorest areas and the poorest districts first. That was something which was unanimously approved by the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee and was written into the report. It was the intent of this legislation, and was made very clear. The fact that the Commissioner of Education will only send and consider applications that come from the poorest areas was the concept of the President of the United States when he sent up the message. That was the consideration which motivated the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and myself in introducing the bill. That is its purpose. Local control has been preserved.

Mr. President, the proposal that has been made by the Senator from Illinois would scuttle this whole concept. If anyone is opposed to the Teachers Corps, I can understand why he will vote for this.

The National Education Association has written in detail to me and stated:

> The proposal that local districts match the salaries of the interns, even to the seemingly minor degree of 10 percent, will be a deterrent precisely to those schools who need help the most?

Mr. President, if we accept or follow the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois, there will be complete disruption of the program. It was the intention of the Senator from Wisconsin and myself to introduce an amendment which would provide at least for full financing, in order to increase the total amount of money which was appropriated.

I say to the Senator from Illinois—whom I do not see in the Chamber at the present moment—that his amendment is once again a false economy, because we did not change the figure of $9.5 million. All we said is that we would permit that to be used for 100 percent financing. The Senator from Illinois has not changed the figure. He has not reduced it. So his claims of economy are false.

Thus, Mr. President, either on the question of economy or the question of local control, or the question of the merits of the bill, and fundamentally on the description of the bill, the Senator from Illinois is completely mistaken. I should like to yield now, if I may, to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I concur with what the Senator from Rhode Island has stated and the Senator from Massachusetts. There has not been any bill in this Congress this session that has been as misrepresented as to its content as this one. This program is completely under local control. The fact is that there is more local control over this Teachers Corps team than local school districts have over their own teachers, because they can fire the Teachers Corps team on 10 seconds' notice, unlike their own teachers, who have tenure. So when the local school invites in a Teachers Corps team—and it has to be invited, and it has to be approved by the State superintendent of schools, and they control the whole curriculums, and they work with the university to make teachers out of these young folks, and if the superintendent of school says, "I do not like what you are doing. Goodby," they are off the payroll.

He cannot do that with his own teachers.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have read his testimony. He does not say.

Mr. MORSE. He does not know what is in the bill.

Mr. NELSON. That is right. Those are the facts about this bill. The Senator from Illinois has mentioned time after time "State participation." Not a single penny of State money is in this bill. Every single penny of the matching fund comes out of that local school budget, not out of the State government treasury. Now another thing I believe which has been overlooked is that the Federal Government has no control over these teams. None. All that the Federal Government does is furnish the money. When the young folks apply and are accepted by the Federal Government, they then go into a college training program for 90 days—for 3 months of intensive teacher training, and then that team leaves and goes to the school which requests the team.

They teach in that school part time. Perhaps 75 percent of the time or thereabouts. The local school district and the local college or university works out a teaching and study program for these young folks who have a bachelor's degree but not a teacher's credentials. They get a master's degree after 2 years in teaching. A major portion of the purpose of the pending bill has nothing to do with helping local school districts. A major portion of its purpose is to attract to the teaching profession young folks who would not otherwise go in. They have bachelor's degrees, but they do not have any intention of going into teaching. So they get them into this program, into the Teachers Corps, and they learn the problems of deprived districts and then they become teachers. As a result, we will have recruited into the teaching profession an additional increment of teachers which this country badly needs.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin, is this a program to develop better teachers, or is it a program to send teachers into certain school districts where teachers are needed?

Which is it? Or is it both?

Mr. NELSON. It has two purposes. One is to give additional teaching assistance to deprived schools, and other schools. The other purpose is to train them to become teachers. One of these objectives is a national purpose and we should not be charging a local school district for educating teachers.

Mr. COOPER. Does the local school district make application to the U.S. Office of Education?

Mr. NELSON. Yes. They apply for a team.

Mr. COOPER. Upon what criteria would the Office of Education approve the application of a specific school district—because obviously there will not be teaching teams enough to go around for every school district? Is the priority for approval based upon some kind of poverty classification?

Mr. NELSON. The emphasis in the programs is to provide Teachers Corps teams to deprived schools.

Mr. COOPER. If the application is approved, would the payment be made into the funds of the local school district? For example, would the salaries of the teachers be paid by the local school district from the funds made available to the local school district, or would their salaries be paid to them directly through some agency of the Federal Government?

Mr. NELSON. As I understand it, a grant for that 90-percent share would be made to the school district and the school district would make out the checks itself.

Mr. COOPER. I understand. Then could the school district, if it found that it did not like the caliber of the teaching of the teachers who were sent there, discharge the teachers?

Mr. NELSON. Yes. As I said a moment ago, a school district—and I worked hard on this provision, because I knew the issue would be raised, and I did not want the Federal Government controlling any teachers at all at the school level, and I had some objection to this. The fact is, by HEW—they can fire them at any time, on 1 minute's notice on any day they wish.

Mr. COOPER. Does the local school board have any authority in the selection of teachers? Or must the local board simply accept or reject the teacher sent to it by the Office of Education?

Mr. NELSON. The local school board would request a Teachers Corps team. They can accept or reject the teams and they can dismiss it at any time.

Mr. COOPER. I notice in the testimony of the Commissioner of Education that he said——

Mr. MORSE. On what page is that?

Mr. COOPER. On pages 186 and 187—next to the last paragraph:

> To place Corps members in the schools by this coming September, we will need to solicit proposals from local school districts.

That would seem to me to indicate that a determination will be made by the Office of Education as to the kinds of school districts to which it will make available teachers. So I return to my first question: Are there criteria which must be met to the satisfaction of the Office of Education before teachers would be sent into a particular school district?

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Here is another question: Can the State department of education disapprove the application of a local school district?

Mr. NELSON. Yes. Before a Teachers Corps team can go into any school dis-

trict it requires the positive approval of the State superintendent or whatever the proper State authority is.

Mr. COOPER. My reason for raising these questions is that while I recognize the proposal has a worthy purpose, this is the first instance which I can remember—and I once served on the Education Subcommittee—in which the Federal Government would actually be selecting teachers and moving them into local school districts. That is a marked change, and a departure, from the idea which has always been expressed so confidently that we all favor and insist upon local control of education. I believe this debate does, therefore, have some significance.

Mr. NELSON. I believe actually, Senator, that when we use the word "selection" in terms of the Federal Government's selecting a team, it is really a clerical function. If we have a young lady or a young man with a bachelor's degree who wishes to participate in this program, he will make an application, but all his training will be in the university and under the control of the school district. That is the end of the Federal Government's having anything to do with it. Thus, it is a matter of clerical or mechanical function—the handling of it. It would have to be handled someplace.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Oregon handled on the floor of the Senate the Higher Education Act of 1965, which included authorization of the Teacher Corps.

Mr. MORSE. I am trying to get the floor for a moment.

Mr. COOPER. I would be glad to have the Senator's views on the issue to which I directed my questions.

Mr. NELSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think that it can be read in the record in this testimony of Mr. Zellers and Mr. Howe as to how they interpreted it.

Mr. MORSE. On what page?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Pages 182 and 186.

In the hearings on this bill on page 186 these questions and answers appear.

Senator YOUNG. Let me ask this question: Would it work this way? If a local school district wanted five teachers all they would have to do is call you and you would send them out there?

Mr. HOWE. In effect, they would apply to the Chief of the Teachers Corps for allocation of Teacher Corps members, yes, sir, and the chances of our being able to send them exactly what they want are pretty slim because we are talking about a program here to train about 3,000 teachers who will serve all across the country.

Senator YOUNG. That is the mechanics. If you had to train teachers, the local district would call you and you would provide the teachers?

Mr. HOWE. These would be teachers trained during the summer in special university programs for the purposes of the program. We would select the districts whose requests we would honor primarily on the basis of the concentration of the disadvantaged children.

We would also give some consideration to the geographical aspect of this, of course.

On page 182 there appears this question:

Senator YOUNG. The selection will be made by your office?

Mr. ZELLERS. The preliminary selection; yes, sir. The selection of eligibles to go into the training program, that is, and we assume the training program will eliminate a certain percentage.

I thought that those excerpts should appear in the RECORD.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to take a very short time to explain the history of the Teacher Corps. The country is indebted to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

I plead with the Senate this afternoon not to adopt the pending amendment because of the effect it is going to have on the substantive program that is involved.

I wish to say at the outset, to understand the importance of this question you must know how the concept developed in relation to the Teacher Corps. It was, in effect, a later thought that developed within the administration after the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin offered their amendments to both the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Under title I of Public Law 89–10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, we have an entire series of special services to school districts which may be selected by the participating school districts to be funded for use in schools having high concentrations of educationally deprived children. These funds may also be used to provide special education to handicapped children who for the purposes of the benefits of the act are considered to be educationally deprived.

I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, that the new Commissioner of Education, who was not in office when this bill was adopted, did go on to say on page 182 under the subhead:

MATCHING BY LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Mr. HOWE. It is not a question of the States matching, but a question of the local community where the teachers are requested being able to match.

Senator YOUNG. Most States have school equalization funds, whereby the States help the local districts. If they don't they should.

Mr. HOWE. There is a great variety of practice in this, actually. Some States provide a high percentage of support for the schools and some a relatively low percentage.

But by the time of year that this decision will be reached to make these special teachers available to local communities, most funds will be pretty well solidified in line items of either State or local budgets and there will be no flexible money to add an additional service.

I should point out this entire Teacher Corps operation provides supplementary services over and above the regular staffing of the schools for the benefit of the kind of youngsters at which the program is directed.

Mr. CARDWELL. On that point it might be noted also this program was authorized in the last session of Congress and the local agencies had anticipated full Federal financing. They have not had an opportunity to prepare in advance for their share of the teacher salaries and the teachers point out they do develop a budget and often they work on tight budgets.

I am exceedingly sorry that those of us on the Committee on Education did not have an opportunity to correct the misconception that was left with the Senator by his understanding of the testimony given by the Commissioner on Education.

I think the Senator will see that as I relate what the program is, and the history of the program. In doing so, I refer back to title I of Public Law 89–10.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 which was enacted prior to the consideration of a Teacher Corps in the Higher Education Act of 1965, provided, for example, for such additional services to school districts, so far as the 100-percent Federal aid was concerned, as the following:

Inservice training for teachers.

Additional teaching personnel to reduce class size.

Teacher aids and instructional secretaries.

Supervisory personnel and full-time specialists for improvement of instruction and to provide related pupil services.

Institutes for training teachers in special skills.

Employment of consultants for improvement of program.

Programs to train teacher aids.

Supplementary instructional materials.

Curriculum materials center for disadvantaged children.

Classes for talented elementary students.

Special classes for physically handicapped, disturbed, and socially maladjusted children.

Preschool training programs.

Remedial programs, especially in reading and mathematics.

Enrichment programs for grades 1, 2, and 3 on Saturday mornings and during summer.

Programed instruction.

Instructional media centers to provide modern equipment and materials.

English programs for non-English-speaking children.

Special audiovisuals for disadvantaged children.

Programs for the early identification and prevention of dropouts.

Increased guidance services for pupils and families.

School-job coordinators.

Home and school visitors and/or social workers.

Early identification of gifted and handicapped among disadvantaged.

Supplemental health and food services.

Language laboratories, science and reading laboratories, laboratories for modern instruction in other subject areas.

School health, psychiatric, and psychological services.

Provision of clothing, shoes, and books where necessary.

Financial assistance to needy high school pupils.

School plant improvements—elementary school science laboratories, libraries, kitchens, and cafeterias.

Equip elementary class rooms for television and radio instruction.

And the list continues.

I wish to point out that title I Public Law 89–10 provides for these special services to meet special needs in the elementary and secondary schools of this country as a supplement to their existing programs. The Teachers Corps program is in addition to Public Law 89–10 benefits. The Teachers Corps program is administered at the local level in the schools just as these services paid for by title I money are administered.

It causes me to say, Mr. President, that last year after the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Massachusetts introduced two separate versions of a Teachers Corps training program, and I introduced the teaching master's fellowship program, the proposals of the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senater from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Oregon were merged into one amendment. That was done at the same time as the President went to the National Education Association convention at Madison Square Garden last summer, there he proposed in his own behalf a variant of a Teachers Corps and a fellowship program plus a grant program to strengthen teacher preparation at both the graduate and undergraduate bill at some institutions. In committee we then took the various proposed amendments and consolidated them into one amendment as a new title V to the Higher Education Act.

The amendment came to the floor of the Senate and it will be found that we adopted both the Teachers Corps and the fellowship amendment as well as the administration grant program. We went then to conference with the House on a number of provisions including title V. There was some division on the House side in conference. There was a proposal by some conferees on the House side that they thought that the cost of the Teachers Corps should be borne in part or in whole by the local school district that was asking for the service and paid for from title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds.

Of course, if they were going to pay 100 percent of that cost or even 50 percent or 10 percent it would have greatly jeopardized the rest of the benefits under title I. Why? Please remember this vital statistic.

I have had printed in the RECORD in the debate on the floor of the Senate last year the large number of school districts in this country that under the School Act do not even get $36,000, and $36,000 is the amount of money that has to be considered for the establishment of a Teachers Corps in any school. It will cost $36,000.

If there had been followed the proposal that some in the House conference wanted to follow then the school district would have to decide whether it was going to have this program and none of the rest of title I at all.

There will be found in the debate last year the number of counties in the United States in which the total aid under the School Act would be around $40,000, $41,000, $42,000. Some may recall that I argued that if there was adopted a program in which the entire Teacher Corps would have to be paid by the local school district nothing would be left for those other needed services. One has only to read the hearings of the committee in regard to the need for these services to know that we could not follow the position of some conferees on the House side.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I would like to finish that point and then yield to the Senator.

It was at that point that the chairman of the House committee, Mr. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, asked me to get in touch with the President and find out the President's position because of the point of view that had been expressed by some House conferees, who were a minority. There is no question about the fact that the majority of the House conferees were in favor of the Teacher Corps. But the minority said unless their recommendation was adopted in conference they would make a fight against the entire program on the floor of the House.

I called the White House. The President was in the hospital, and I talked to Mr. Jack Valenti. Mr. POWELL wanted me to get a message to the President to find out his position on the Teacher Corps. Mr. Valenti said he was about to call the President. He called me back in a little over 15 minutes and said the President's advice to me was to hold firm for the Teacher Corps on the basis of his proposal at Madison Square Garden, and the proposal found in the Kennedy-Nelson amendment; that that was what he strongly supported. That is what the conference approved and that was what was adopted into law. It is a part of the law now.

We remember last year that, after it became a part of the law, funds were not appropriated for it in the House, and we ended up with a situation in which, although the Teachers Corps was adopted, no funds were provided other than a very small amount to start the administration of the act in the Office of Education.

Now I come to the procedure under the law. I stress the fact that the school district has 100-percent control over the hiring and the firing of the members of the Teachers Corps. As the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin have pointed out, the school district can hire them today and fire them tomorrow. It does not have to accept them in the first place. The total control of the Teachers Corps unit that is invited by a school district to any school rests with the school district and the administrators of the school. The Federal Government has no authority under the Teachers Corps law to impose any teacher group upon any school. The hiring and firing comes 100 percent within local control. This fact was made very clear in the debate when the authorization bill was before the Senate.

What is the Teachers Corps? The Teachers Corps is a group of people specially trained to handle certain problem children cases, many of them special cases. It is true that the Corps will go primarily into poor school districts, but poor school districts are not the only school districts in the country that have so-called problem cases. There is a great need for remedial, therapeutic, and special education teaching specialists. I do not like to use the term "problem cases" because of its negative connotation; nevertheless, I know of no more descriptive words. Perhaps "behavior problems" or "health related problems" or "learning difficulty" problems may be better terms.

The work of the Corps encompasses problems that arise from home environment or problems that arise from the intellectual ability of the child; that is, the child may not be retarded in the sense that he should not be sent to school, but lacks sufficient capacity to make progress with the rest of the class. As a result, in a year or two the child is a potential dropout; he stays in the same grade for 1, 2, or 3 years

The proposal is to have the educators of the country—that is, the authorities in the field of the educational process in the training of students—develop a group of teachers, who are recognized as experts in that field who will instruct a group of students in universities who are preparing for the teaching profession. It is a form of teacher training through daily practice under a highly skilled professional, of the various aspects of the teaching art. Everyone is aware of the practice-teaching programs that students training for the teaching profession have to undergo in order to qualify for their teacher certificates.

The school district would get such a corps of specially trained teachers. The funds are provided in the bill. The whole act is administered under a State plan. The State would have to adopt a State plan and place it on file, and it would have to be approved as qualifying under the objectives of the act. It would be placed on file at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would select from applicants who had applied for the Teachers Corps program, those recommended for training by the participating institutions of higher education who would perform the academic training.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would not send out the teachers. The Department would communicate with school districts, inform them of the teachers and teams available, the qualifications of the teacher, and the training that the teacher has had in the particular problems of the recipient school. The school board would then decide whether it wanted that teacher and the student assistance. The school board gets only the money from the Federal Government, and the school board has the authority to select the personnel from the pool of trained personnel that is available. The school board can hire the teachers and can keep them as long as it wishes. If the teachers do not meet the requirements of the school board, the board can fire them. The board would not be limited by any tenure laws at all.

In the hearing conducted by the Education Subcommittee yesterday, Dr. Briggs, the superintendent of schools of Cleveland, Ohio, made an eloquent plea for the Teacher Corps program. I was quite surprised by his testimony with respect to the problems of poverty that are growing in the city of Cleveland, as people of better means are moving to the suburbs. He made an eloquent plea for the support of the Teacher Corps program. He stressed the need of the pro-

gam in order to meet the special educational problems of educationally deprived children.

If Senators propose to consider the program on the basis of the local school district paying all or 50 percent or 10 percent of the cost, the school districts will be placed in the position of having to make a choice as to whether they are going to use the teacher program or any of the other programs that are enumerated under title I all of which can be critically needed by a district.

With respect to the so-called behavior child, the child who has some psychological problems, or the "learning difficulty" child all of us are aware of their need, for example, for remedial reading techniques or for audiovisual aids in helping these youngsters master their school work. These are very important factors.

It is unwise to say, "We will put the Teacher Corps off here by itself, and put you in a position so that if you have only $40,000 or $41,000, and you take a Teaching Corps program, $36,000 will have to be used for it, leaving $4,000, $5,000, $6,000, or $7,000 for the rest of title I." That is not fair.

I say most respectfully that no argument can be made in the name of inflation for supporting an amendment that would require a school district or a State to pay 50 percent. The same American dollars are involved, whether they are paid by the Federal Government or by the State government. In my judgment, it is a fallacious argument to refer to it as inflation.

The question is whether there is a need in 1966 to spend money for these boys and girls, in order to seek to rehabilitate them and to give them a chance to overcome whatever handicaps they may have. The Teachers Corps, in my judgment, is based on the major premise that these teams can become specialists in the handling of special problems of special children. The program encompasses a group of young people who are preparing to be special teachers in this special field.

I am at a loss to understand why we have the argument of inflation confronting us as a barricade. The same number of dollars are involved, whether they come from the Federal Government or the State government.

I am at a loss to understand why there is an argument that this program would establish Federal control. To the contrary, every precaution has been taken to prevent this. I would not have supported the bill if such a precaution were not in it. Under the bill, the local school district and the State have control. In the first place, the Federal Government only provides the money for financing the training program and for financing the sending of trainees, at the request of the school district, into the school.

(Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. COOPER addressed the Chair.)

Mr. PASTORE. I shall yield first to the Senator from Ohio and then to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall defer to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The amount does not concern me greatly. My questions were made in an effort to learn more about the nature of the proposed program, and about the exact procedures to be followed. I know that it was adopted in the law last year. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon, who managed the bill in the Senate, and also to the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Massachusetts, who were concerned with this particular section of the bill, for giving their interpretation of the nature of the control of the program.

I wish to make one point, which I still hold after hearing all explanations. In my opinion, there is one factor which distinguishes this program from other Federal programs dealing with education, in terms of control. This is the only Federal aid program dealing with education in which the teachers for elementary schools are first selected and trained by the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. The program for the training of the teachers is a Federal program, and the reason is obvious. It could not be done on a local school district basis since it also involves relationships with institutions of higher education.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that. The program also provides for the selection of those who will have the benefit of training and, therefore, who will finally be assigned to school districts.

Mr. MORSE. That is in the hands of the universities that conduct the program. It is in the hands of those back at the grassroots. It is a part of the program of an educational school at the University of Kentucky, the University of Ohio, the University of Oregon, Columbia University, or any other such institution of learning. They are training the people; the Federal Government is not training them. There should be no misapprehension that the Federal Government is training these teachers. The Federal Government is financing the training of the teachers. The teachers are being trained by the universities of the country just as, I submit, all our teachers are trained.

This training program is a part of the higher education training program in this country. The Federal Government does not pick a single human being or a single body for this program. The bodies are picked by the universities that set up the program and open the registration to persons who are interested, on a voluntary basis, to be trained as teachers in this special higher education program.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio. I am happy that the Senator from Kentucky asked these questions, so that he would have an explanation of the program and knowledge of the way in which it operates.

Mr. COOPER. The statement has been made by those who were in charge of the bill providing the basic authority that they did not seek to have Federal control written into the bill. I am satisfied.

Mr. President, I have voted today against the rent subsidy program, and I have expressed my concern about Federal control of the Teachers Corps proposal. But, as the second supplemental appropriations bill provides needed funds for other programs which are vital, I shall vote for passage of the bill as whole.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very anxious from the standpoint of the children involved that we do not scuttle the program that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin had the great wisdom to see far in advance of a large number of educators in this country.

Once the educators knew of the program outlined by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin, they came and gave us testimony on the basis of which we made the recommendation last year.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the purpose of my questions will be to establish what programs are now in existence on a Federal level to help in the development of an army of teachers for primary, secondary, and higher institutions of learning.

The Senator from Oregon is a member of the committee and I am quite sure that he has rather detailed information on this subject.

It is my understanding that the 1967 budget contains a figure in excess of $1 billion for the helping of primary and secondary education. This $1 billion is under title I and is intended to serve areas with concentrations of children from low-income families throughout the country.

Do we have this $1 billion program of assisting schools in the operation of their primary and secondary educational system especially to help the low-income families?

Mr. MORSE. My answer is first, all the programs that are recognized in title I of the Education Act of 1965 are aimed at helping the children who attend impoverished schools but are not limited in the act as a whole to merely impoverished schools. The key point in title I, is that such schools serve areas having a high concentration of educationally deprived children. But, as I brought out in the debate last year, if we had a child with a hearing problem in such an area, money under title I could be used to send him to the wealthiest public school in the school district if that school had facilities he needed to overcome his problem. The act would apply to those children who need that remedial treatment. The same is true whether there is a problem relating to a physically handicapped child, with visual defects, or even problems involving his neuro-muscular system, the program should not be limited merely to the handicapped child in a poverty-stricken school district. It should extend to other districts also. This is a matter we are currently pursuing in our hearings on S. 3046.

All the programs under title I fall within the appropriated amount. It is for the Appropriations Committee to appropriate, but the authorization would cover about $1.7 billion for the whole program.

The testimony showed that we must pay attention to these special educational problems. If we get a problem of dropouts, and not the standard program of reading, writing, and arithmetic, we

should stop the occurrence of dropouts and make improvement on the problem of retarded children. We must have the entire program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The answer to my question is "Yes."

Mr. MORSE. Yes; but it is better to have it explained.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not mean to have any unfair implication.

Mr. MORSE. And the Senator never does. He would not think of it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is the Higher Education Act of 1965, and that higher education act is intended to provide teachers for various schools in the country.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct insofar as title V is concerned, but I stress that universities train teachers, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then there is title IV(b) which deals with 100-percent loan forgiveness for student borrowers who subsequently teach in schools having large numbers of disadvantaged children.

Mr. MORSE. That is in keeping with one of the basic principles of our whole economy, a principle of which the Senator and I are so proud, the incentive motive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Title IV(b) means that a student studying to be a teacher can borrow the money, and if that student agrees to go into an area in which there are impoverished children, his obligation to repay the debt is completely forgiven.

Mr. MORSE. If the teacher is employed in the State designated school receiving title I benefits. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is title XI of the National Defense and Education Act which authorizes summer and fall session training institutes for teachers who are going to work with disadvantaged children.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have thus far enumerated four categories of finances which are provided by the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The program that we are now discussing contemplates a somewhat different procedure. It contemplates that the Federal Government would allocate teachers to help in the development of other efficient teachers in training the handicapped or disadvantaged children which the Senator from Oregon identified.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. However, there is more to it than that, if I may supplement it by saying that the Teachers Corps program provides funds for two purposes. It will set up the programs in the universities that will register the individuals that are going to be trained for these specialties. However, in charge of those courses will be existing specialists, and there are not very many. That is one thing that our hearings records show—the need to get busy and get these specialists trained. However, there are some, and to the extent that they are available to be sent out, they will be sent out to the school districts which want them, along with apprentices, teacher apprentices to go into the school district to provide supplementary teaching services to the special problem children during the academic year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is another program in which the Federal Government finances 10,000 fellowships for persons who want to teach. The Federal Government would train them to be especially experienced in this field of teaching those people.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. That is also part of title V of the Higher Education Act, currently recommended to be funded, I believe, at a 6,500 level.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So there are five programs now in existence. Does any one of those five programs embody the philosophy in which the Federal Government receives an application to send teachers in, acts upon the application, sends the teachers in—teachers who may or may not be accepted, depending on the will of the recipient—and the Federal Government then pays the salaries of those teachers?

Mr. MORSE. No. The services of the other five programs do not meet the special needs of this particular service.

We must have a body of these specialists with some assistants to go into the impoverished area schools to help the superintendent and the principal and the teachers through supplementary teaching services handle the problem that they may have in that school. The Federal Government does not select them. The University of Ohio selects them. The University of Minnesota selects them. The University of Columbia selects them. For that is where they are. They are not down here in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The University of Ohio, the Columbia University, and the University of Minnesota, and every other education department that has a desire to participate in this particular field makes known to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the availability of any personnel that it has.

One of our real problems is that we will not have enough personnel to meet all of the demand for a few years, but we have some personnel. Let us use them. That is the plea.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that the universities will teach them for 3 months, but the allocation of these developed teachers is to be made by the Federal Government in respect to applications filed with the Government.

Mr. MORSE. They will be given a list of who is available. In my judgment the part that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would play in this would be pretty much that of a clearing house as to the availability of personnel.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What bothers me, and I shall be very frank with the Senator from Oregon, is that this is the first time in all these programs that the idea has been evolved that the Federal Government will send to local areas the teachers that are available for training in the particular field involved.

Mr. MORSE. It does not send them in. I do not like the semantics of the Senator. It does not send them in. It tells them who is available and they do the selecting.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is not quite in conformity with what the Senator from North Dakota read.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think a program should be jeopardized by the response of the Senator from North Dakota and the response from the witness chair of the new Commissioner of Education. But let us look at his prepared statement on pages 186 and 187:

ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS

Senator YOUNG. Let me ask this question: Would it work this way? If a local school district wanted five teachers all they would have to do is call you and you would send them out there?

Mr. HOWE. In effect, they would apply to the Chief of the Teachers Corps for allocation of Teachers Corps members; yes, sir, and the chances of our being able to send them exactly what they want are pretty slim because we are talking about a program here to train about 3,000 teachers who will serve all across the country.

Senator YOUNG. That is the mechanics. If you had to train teachers, the local district would call you and you would provide the teachers?

Mr. HOWE. These would be teachers trained during the summer in special university programs for the purposes of the program. We would select the districts whose requests we would honor primarily on the basis of the concentration of the disadvantaged children.

We would also give some consideration to the geographical aspect of this, of course.

Senator PASTORE. Any further questions on this?

Are you satisfied with the $10 million?

Mr. HOWE. Yes, sir.

Senator PASTORE. We will insert your statement.

(The statement follows:)

"STATEMENT BY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to appear before you to testify on behalf of the President's request for funds to begin operation of a National Teachers Corps. As President Johnson stated when he proposed the National Teacher Corps to the Congress: 'The National Teacher Corps draws on that spirit of dedication of Americans which has been demonstrated time and again, in peace and war, by young and old, at home and abroad. It will provide a challenge and an opportunity for teachers with a sense of mission—those best suited to the momentous tasks this Nation faces in improving education.'

"The National Teachers Corps legislation and the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act, both enacted by the 89th Congress, are based upon the principles that a good education is the key to a better future for the disadvantaged child, and that a good teacher is the vital and indispensable element in that good education. But today, we are faced with an alarming shortage of teachers, particularly in the schools which serve our less fortunate children.

"According to the National Education Association, the national supply of beginning teachers last September fell 118,000 short of the 248,000 needed. The National Teacher Corps will help us meet this need and will focus the training of its members in the schools with the greatest need. The request for funds to begin operations in fiscal year 1966 amounts to $13.2 million. These funds will be used to place approximately 3,750 corps members in teaching positions this September. The House has allowed $10 million for the program, a reduction of $3,200,000 from our request. It also provides that the Federal share for salaries of the teachers

may not exceed 90 percent, and that State educational agencies must approve the corps programs of individual school districts. This reduction would decrease the number of corps members from 3,750 to 3,000. We are making no appeal for restoration of the funds, but we are strongly recommending an amendment to allow us to increase the Federal share above 90 percent if a local district can fully justify its inability to provide its share of the salary costs. Although no salaries will be paid from the 1966 supplemental request, this provision may preclude certain districts from participating in the program. While we agree in principle with local districts sharing the salary costs, the amendment would insure all eligible districts an opportunity to benefit from the corps.

"Preservice training for corps members will take place this summer at institutions of higher education. Beginning with the fall semester in September, teachers and teacher-interns will start teaching disadvantaged children, and the teacher-interns will enter part-time academic study leading to a graduate degree. The selection of training institutions and of participating schools, and the assignment of corps members will be directed toward obtaining a cross section of the circumstances and types of problems, both urban and rural, that are encountered in educating the disadvantaged.

"Included in the supplemental request are funds for the cost of 3 months' preservice training, institutional support for intern academic training, change of residence, and local school administration. Funds for salary compensation of corps members are included in the fiscal 1967 budget request.

"The National Teachers Corps will provide opportunities to recent college graduates to time continue their education toward advanced degrees. The corps will also seek to attract experienced teachers who will head teams of teacher-interns and provide the on-the-spot direction and guidance that may be necessary. By the use of teaching teams, I believe the National Teachers Corps will demonstrate a useful and effective approach in preparing able college graduates for teaching careers. It is based upon the principle that the way to learn teaching is to do it under expert guidance. In addition, this program will encourage the development of teacher preparation in the colleges and universities, with a specific orientation toward serving disadvantaged youth.

"Your prompt action on this supplemental request is respectfully requested to enable us to move forward to commence operation of the National Teachers Corps as already authorized by the Congress. To place corps members in the schools by this coming September, we will need to solicit proposals from local school districts and institutions of higher education; make arrangements for summer and academic year training and for teaching assignments; recruit and assign corps members for training and teaching posts. All this takes time and the time factor has now become critical. Local school districts will very shortly be making plans for the coming academic year; universities have not yet been selected for training corps members. After selection, they must prepare curriculums, recruit instructors, and provide facilities; teachers will soon be making their contracts for the next academic year; and college graduates will be making decisions on postgraduation employment or further education. We need to move ahead now.

"I and my staff will be glad to answer any questions you may have."

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not hesitate to say that I have a deep apprehension about the initiation of a program that will give to the Federal Government the power to send an army of teachers to the communities.

Mr. MORSE. But it is not doing that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This bill provides for the training of 3,000 at present. What it will be next year and in 1970 and 1972, no one can foretell.

Mr. MORSE. It cannot last longer than the authorization. The argument has been made this afternoon that it is a permanent program. It can be a permanent program only for the life of the law. That is only for the period of the authorization.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield at that point? It can only be to the extent that we appropriate the money.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly; all the checks are there. This is not in perpetuity. I think it will go on for many years, because the Senator from Ohio will be voting for it for many years, after we bring forth the evidence, if he will let us get it started, as to the desirability of it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in response to what has just been said, I have been here for 9 years, and I cannot recall a single program of grants in those 9 years which, once instituted, has been either reduced or canceled.

Mr. MORSE. They are working so well; that is why.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The grants are increased each year. They grow and grow. And I think we can lay it down axiomatically that this is a $9.5 million program for the fiscal year of 1966, but in 1975 it will still be here, and the amount will have increased greatly.

I thank the Senator very much for not filibustering my questions. He answered them directly, and I appreciate it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to tarry with the Senator for just a moment, because I always like to thank someone who has been particularly kind in behalf of my committee. I thank the Senator from Ohio for what I think is one of the finest compliments ever paid the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its Education Subcommittee, that because we have done the job so well, apparently, in all the 9 years to which the Senator refers, and our authorization proposals show the great care we have taken in proposing sound programs, there has been no need for reducing grants, but they have been increased year by year because they are clearly so much needed.

I say to the Senator, give me your vote on this, and I tell you that in 5 years you will be standing up here urging more money for the Teacher Corps, to deal with underprivileged children.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There are two assumptions under which a program is continued; one, because it is meritorious; second, though not meritorious, because of its political dangers, there is a fear to either reduce it or eliminate it.

Mr. MORSE. I have much higher respect for the Senate than that.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. It was my privilege to serve under the able leadership of the Senator from Oregon as chairman of the subcommittee when we passed the basic legislation last year. I well recall the conference we had, too, with our friends from the House, and the difficulties they raised with the Teachers Corps program. We were concerned for a while, were we not, that we might lose it?

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon went directly to the President of the United States and received his strong endorsement for the legislation as it was passed, and as a result of that strong endorsement, we now have a Teacher Corps in being, on a sound and sensible basis.

To me, the pending amendment is a wicked amendment. It is an evil amendment, because what it purports to do is to change, in an appropriation bill, the fixed policy determined last year by the Congress of the United States at the recommendation of the President of the United States, in a bill which the President signed; is that not correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Now, it may well be that under the rules of this body, the pending amendment is in order. But I say that anybody who votes for the pending amendment had no business voting for the major legislation in the first place; that this is an effort, again, by the Appropriations Committee, to change the law as adopted by the legislative committees of the Congress, and to me this is wrong. I wonder if the Senator from Oregon agrees with me.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator, and I speak with great respect for the Appropriations Committee. I know how overburdened they are, and what a great group they have on the committee.

But as the Senator knows, from time to time I have felt that we work our heads off on a legislative committee, we come out with a program, we take the evidence, as we have taken it in this matter—we listened to the educational authorities, not one of whom the Appropriations Committee has had the opportunity to listen to—and we come forward with a substantive program. I think before that substantive program is changed indirectly by the Appropriations Committee, that we at least should be consulted with. We should be called in to find out what effect of a proposal being considered in the Appropriations Committee would have on the substantive nature of the legislation.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is aware—is he not?—that under our present archaic and utterly illogical rules, when appropriations are considered for programs initiated by certain legislative committees, members of those legislative committees sit ex officio with the Appropriations Committee? But not in this case. For some reason, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is considered sort of a poor sister or poor brother. We do not have the privilege given to many another committee of con-

sulting before the Appropriations Committee, and with a vote, before the legislation is passed.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say this, meaning no reflection at all: I think it is just a matter of breakdown in communications, where everybody is busy, whether he is on the Appropriations Committee or any other committee.

We have the committee system—I do not know how we could run the Senate without the committee system—and we have a breakdown in communications. I did not have any idea that this particular problem was being considered.

I think the Appropriations Committee has been very considerate in trying to do the best it can on the basis of the information it had. It has before it the Commissioner of Education, and relies on him. In this case, on some points I think he and his staff were in error.

What I do think we should do, however, as members of the legislative committee, when the point is raised, as it has been raised here this afternoon, is not use an amendment to, in effect, set aside a large share of the purpose of the Teachers Corps program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not wish to say that I resent this, but the fact remains——

Mr. MORSE. I did not mean it in any way that the Senator should have any basis for resentment.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope Senators are not finding any fault with what the Appropriations Committee did on this item.

Mr. MORSE. No, I am talking about the discussion we have had as to what was discussed in the Appropriations Committee as to the legislative meaning of the program.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island understood it, and understood it very well. I mean I have no doubts, I have no qualms about this.

The fact remains that the House voted a 90–10 formula, and wrote it into the law. Some people think it should be 100 percent. I think there is some reason for 90–10; I am willing to go along with it.

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly willing to go along with 100 percent.

Mr. PASTORE. But the committee did not subscribe at all to this existing amendment. This is something brand new, and something I never heard of before until this afternoon. I think that the Appropriations Subcommittee went along with the legislative committee on this item. We have no faults to find here.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have made my case. However, I ask unanimous consent that the full item in the Education Act of 1965, on page 443 of the print that I was using, setting forth the services that are available under title I of the bill, be printed in the RECORD. It begins on page 442 with the title "Uses of Funds by School Districts," and runs over, on page 444, to the beginning of the next topic.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USES OF FUNDS BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Under the terms of the legislation, a local public school district may use funds granted to it for the broad purpose of programs and projects which will meet the educational needs of educationally deprived children in those school attendance areas in the district having high concentrations of children from low-income families. It is the intention of the proposed legislation not to prescribe the specific types of programs or projects that will be required in school districts. Rather, such matters are left to the discretion and judgment of the local public educational agencies since educational needs and requirements for strengthening educational opportunities for educationally deprived elementary and secondary school pupils will vary from State to State and district to district. What might be an acceptable and effective program in a school district serving a rural area may be entirely inappropriate for a school district serving an urban area, and vice versa. There may be circumstances where a whole school system is basically a low-income area and the best approach in meeting the needs of educationally deprived children would be to upgrade the regular program. On the other hand, in many areas the needs of educationally deprived children will not be satisfied by such an approach.

The committee received a wealth of evidence and testimony from educational specialists as to new techniques of instruction and educational innovations which were being developed as a result of research and experimentation in education. Many new devices employing audiovisual material, electronic equipment, use of educational television, and other similar equipment are being employed, some only in demonstration projects, and offer promise of increasing the educational opportunity of elementary and secondary students. Hopefully their use will broaden as a result of this legislation. To the maximum extent possible, this legislation gives encouragement to local school districts to employ imaginative thinking and new approaches to meet the educational needs of poor children.

The committee also received testimony from witnesses as to the following possible programs for educationally deprived children:

Inservice training for teachers.

Additional teaching personnel to reduce class size.

Teacher aids and instructional secretaries.

Supervisory personnel and full-time specialists for improvement of instruction and to provide related pupil services.

Institutes for training teachers in special skills.

Employment of consultants for improvement of program.

Programs to train teacher aids.

Supplementary instructional materials.

Curriculum materials center for disadvantaged children.

Classes for talented elementary students.

Special classes for physically handicapped, disturbed, and socially maladjusted children.

Preschool training programs.

Remedial programs, especially in reading and mathematics.

Enrichment programs for grades 1, 2, and 3 on Saturday mornings and during summer.

Programed instruction.

Instructional media centers to provide modern equipment and materials.

English programs for non-English-speaking children.

Special audiovisuals for disadvantaged children.

Programs for the early identification and prevention of dropouts.

Increased guidance services for pupils and families.

School-job coordinators.

Home and school visitors and/or social workers.

Early identification of gifted and handicapped among disadvantaged.

Supplemental health and food services.

Language laboratories, science and reading laboratories, laboratories for modern instruction in other subject areas.

School health, psychiatric, and psychological services.

Provision of clothing, shoes, and books where necessary.

Financial assistance to needy high school pupils.

School plant improvements—elementary school science laboratories, libraries, kitchens, and cafeterias.

Equip elementary classrooms for television and radio instruction.

Purchase of musical recordings of classical nature, and recordings of poems and addresses.

Mobile learning centers.

Educational summer camps.

College coaching classes.

Arts and crafts programs during summer vacation.

Summer school and day camp.

Summer programs for development of language skills.

Full-day summer school.

Shop and library facilities available after regular school hours.

Work experience programs.

On-the-job training for high school students.

Field trips for cultural and educational development.

Expansion of libraries in major disciplines.

Scheduling of concerts, dramas, and lectures; mobile art exhibits and libraries.

Saturday morning special opportunity classes.

Bookmobiles—home oriented.

Afterschool study centers.

Preschool pupil transportation.

Pupil exchange programs (semester, year, summer).

The above enumeration is not intended in any way to limit the possible uses of funds by the local school district in improving public elementary and secondary education. It should be noted that a school district is required to develop programs and projects designed to meet the special educational needs of all educationally deprived children in the school attendance area, regardless of whether such children are presently attending school. Such programs could take the form of special part-time programs, or programs to return to school, children who have dropped out. However, the listing is illustrative of the many possibilities for uses of funds which are already being considered and conducted by educators.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, and I assure him that I would be brief.

But may I say to the Senator from Oregon that in my judgment, this pending amendment should be opposed by every Senator who voted to support the Appalachia program, because this takes money out of the poor school districts in Appalachia. It should be opposed by every Senator who voted for the poverty program, because this takes money out of the most poverty-stricken school districts in the country. It should be opposed by every Senator who voted for civil rights, because the schools which would be penalized by the proposed Dirksen amendment are, to a large extent, schools were our Negro children are being trained.

And this amendment should be opposed if for no other reason than that it would continue the present short supply of schoolteachers, which is one of the great detriments to having a proper educational system in our country.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator. I put my position this way: It should be opposed by those who really want to be of help to boys and girls with special problems.

Let me say, the money that is involved here is a widow's mite compared with the huge sum of money that we will spend in keeping these children, when they become adults, in prison or on welfare, or in mental hospitals, or in connection with various governmental behavior control programs. Because here is the place to get them adjusted to life. Here is the place to try, at least, to cure the problems that are making them the special cases that they are.

This does not amount, in my judgment, considering the human values involved as well as the economic values to our country, to a pittance compared with what the other costs I have mentioned would be.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, we have been listening to some of the proponents of the Teacher Corps give us an outline of what they say is in the Teacher Corps legislation.

By and large, I would say that there were many facts brought out which have been helpful to the debate; but it seems to me that some other points should be made, and I would like to make them because the basis for these points was originally created by a question from the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Last year, on October 20, when the Senate was debating this bill, I warned about what I thought were some of the problems surrounding the Teacher Corps. I wish to repeat some of those points. We have had testimony before the Education Subcommittee, of which I am a member, and we have had testimony just recently—today, yesterday, and last week—pointing out that one of the problems with title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the fact that in processing the new projects and the new applications, experienced teachers—who were formerly going into the ordinary curriculum—were being moved over, and the curriculum itself, on the established programs, were being downgraded. This has happened in my State. It has also happened in many other States. It is creating a problem because of a shortage of personnel.

I would predict, as I did last fall, that one of the great problems in the National Teachers Corps is going to be the pirating of teachers from one district to another. We are going to have, for example, a school district which feels it is short of teachers and therefore wants and requests the Federal Government to supply the funds to bring in more teachers. We will have then created a prestige corps, and another district will lose its teachers, by having them pirated by the first district which made the application. We will have a pirating of teachers all over this country. This is one of the points I made last year during the discussion on the original bill.

In addition, as I pointed out to the Senate last fall, no matter how we slice it, no matter how we look at it, when a local school district has teachers who were brought in under this program and whose salaries, expenses and training have been paid for by the Federal Government, there is going to be a second separate category of teaching personnel imposed on this country. I would say that no matter how we look at it, if we have in any single district one teacher being paid by the Federal Government and another teacher whose salary is coming out of the local school district, we will have created two categories of teachers. We will have created an overlay of Federal control and Federal responsibility which was not there before.

I completely agree with what the Senator from Oregon has said, that the local school district can fire these people any time they wish to do so. They do not have to take the team sent to them. They would say, "We need teachers in this district." The State board of education would say, "We also need teachers." They would apply to Washington, and Washington would send them back a team, and in the team would come. This could be a team which has little or no experience in the area. They may have been trained in another area and not know the customs and problems of the area they are to teach in. There is nothing in the bill, so far as I know—and if I am wrong I hope that the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Massachusetts will correct me, which says that the National Teacher Corps has to teach only in areas where there are deprived children, or only in areas where there are problem children. They can teach in any State where the local school district wants them, regardless of what or where it may be.

Thus, what we are doing, it seems to me, is just as clear as it can be. We are implementing a program where there is a possibility of pirating of needed teachers from one area to another. Second, we are creating an overlay of Federal teaching in local and secondary schools which will have a major impact on the educational system of this country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator knows how much I appreciate the work he does on the Education Subcommittee, and the great help he is to us in raising critical problems—just as he is doing this afternoon in debate. But I want the RECORD to show that I disagree with the conclusions he has reached.

I recognize that from the standpoint of policies title V of the Higher Education Act is going to have to be implemented by various regulations that are being worked out but I reject completely his fear that this will lead to teacher-pirating.

For example, if a school district in Mankato, Minn., has made a request for the special type of help that the Teachers Corps is trained to perform, it does not mean that they can get an English teacher out of Ann Arbor, Mich., to come to Mankato to teach there under this program.

Mr. DOMINICK. There is nothing that would prevent it, let me say to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that the Senator is in error. Let me point out the procedure by which this program is implemented. First, there has to be submitted to the program the State plan, in which there will be incorporated in it this need for the kind of special teaching required.

The school district then has to submit its case for funds for this kind of special training. It does not get the money unless, on the basis of the program for which it requests the teacher and her assistance, it is found that it substantiates the case.

To take a hypothetical case, say we had a problem in some school district for retarded children, but not so retarded that they could not attend a public school. They would not need to be sent to a home for retarded children because their IQ's, although not high—perhaps a low average—would enable them to attend a public school, under proper guidance. I make the case for a Teacher Corps team which could help such a group of students. They have got to make that kind of representation before they could get the teacher, of course. Should they seem to use the teams and teachers improperly, then of course a question of such a use of the funds could arise. Which I am sure would be covered under the regulations and agreements entered into.

Mr. DOMINICK. I will say to the Senator that I fully understand his purpose in this matter, but I would also say that there is nothing in the legislation which says that this is the way it has to work. It simply says that they make an application, the State approves it, and then if there are teachers available, they are made available to the local district together with the money. We would hope that in order to get approval of the Teachers Corps going into that area, there would be a special need; but that does not indicate that the teacher, once there, under the control of the school district, cannot do something else, and perhaps be placed in a totally unrelated teaching assignment.

The point I am making is, that we will be creating a situation where we will have two levels of teachers. I emphasize that I believe we are going to have a substantial pirating of teachers from other school districts. Of course, this does not make any difference to other people, but I believe it is a problem of serious concern, particularly at a time when we have many problems in the educational field, sometimes created by the impact of title I on secondary and elementary schools.

Mr. MORSE. Let me point out, if the Senator will yield to me further for half a minute, that they have to make their

application. Take a look at what they have to do in their application. They have to establish the need for special teachers, to meet their special needs. That application is what is binding. Then, of course, if they walk out on that application, they fall under the jurisdiction of their State authorities. Do not forget that the State authorities have supervision over them, not the Federal Government.

If there is any misuse of funds different from what they applied for before, they would have the responsibility.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to say one word——

Mr. DOMINICK. Let me say before I sit down, that I can conceive of nothing more difficult for the Office of Education than to be suddenly faced with a situation where it has sent in a team at the request of the local district, which through Federal funds, has been paying it—and the teachers, who have been sent in under the Teacher Corps, are trying to do some of the job that has been asked for them, and the school board has also asked them to do some work. There are then two choices.

They will either refuse to do what has been asked by the local authorities or they will do it. If they refuse, they are subject to being fired. If they do do it, then I gather from what the Senator from Oregon said, it is possibly a misapplication of funds which should be cut off. I cannot think of a more embarrassing spot to put the Office of Education in than that.

These are some of the problems which the Teacher Corps bring to mind. It is another reason why I believe that if we would proceed slowly on this program, we will be far better off.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator frome Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent because of death in his immediate family and is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 69 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Allott	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bennett	Hruska	Simpson
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Cotton	Lausche	Tower
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Mundt	
Fannin	Murphy	

NAYS—64

Aiken	Inouye	Muskie
Bartlett	Jackson	Nelson
Bass	Javits	Pastore
Bayh	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Boggs	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Brewster	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Burdick	Kuchel	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Cannon	Long, La.	Robertson
Church	Magnuson	Russell, Ga.
Clark	Mansfield	Scott
Douglas	McCarthy	Smith
Eastland	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McGee	Stennis
Ervin	McGovern	Symington
Fong	McIntyre	Talmadge
Fulbright	Metcalf	Tydings
Gore	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Monroney	Yarborough
Hartke	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Hill	Morse	
Holland	Moss	

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Dodd	Neuberger
Bible	Gruening	Russell, S.C.
Byrd, Va.	Harris	Saltonstall
Carlson	Hayden	Smathers
Case	McNamara	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to have the attention of Senators. There are two more amendments to be offered. They are not controversial, so far as I know. I have no desire to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the final passage of the bill, unless Senators desire to have one. I think we ought to know now whether they do, so that we can expedite the bill. It can be disposed of within 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. COTTON. I wished to ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator desire to do so?

Mr. COTTON. I do.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was necessarily absent from the Senate, at a hearing before a House subcommittee, at the time that the debate on the rent supplement program occurred. Had I been here, I would have propounded some questions to the Senator from Rhode Island, to make certain that my facts were correct.

The Senator from Rhode Island may recall that the rent supplement program was provided for legislatively in the Housing Act of 1965. I was the floor manager of the bill at the time, and I remember the facts from the legislation. But I wonder whether these facts were brought out before the Senator's subcommittee.

I am aware that the Senator from Louisiana touched on the fact today that there has been a desire, over a long period of time, to get away from public housing or to devise some other kind of program that might someday be a substitute for it.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; and to bring private industry into this endeavor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The housing proposed to be built under this act is to be built by private enterprise, and such housing is to go on the tax rolls in its respective communities.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The housing is privately sponsored, privately built, privately managed, and privately owned, and the selection of tenants is made by the sponsors, subject to income and other qualifications set by FHA.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was this fact brought out also? I recall that a pertinent fact in our discussion last year was that actually this type of housing is cheaper for the Government than public housing. The figures given us at that time, as I recall, were that for public housing, the average monthly subsidy would be $58, whereas under the rent supplement program it is estimated to be $40 a month.

Mr. PASTORE. It was not brought out specifically in those amounts, but it was brought out in a general way that rent supplement housing is cheaper.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether it was brought to the attention of the committee that 9 million families are now occupying substandard housing in this country.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mrs. Marie McGuire, who is the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, gave information to our committee that applications for 500,000 public housing units are now on the waiting list.

Mr. PASTORE. Perhaps more.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the number she gave us.

In other words, without rent supplement, additional public housing will be needed.

Mr. PASTORE. Additional public housing will be needed, unless these people are expected to live in slums.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I understand correctly that the effect of the vote in the Senate today is to accept the House language?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And it clearly spells out income and asset limits. The income must be that which would qualify families for public housing.

Mr. PASTORE. Not in the act; but the rules and regulations that have been promulgated do bring those facts out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that this provision is in there, also:

That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island was not in complete sympathy with those provisions, but they are in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, these projects, or any part of these projects, cannot be imposed upon any community, without the consent and approval of the local governing body.

Mr. PASTORE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is aware that there is another provision in the Housing Act. It was included at my insistence, at the conference in connection with the 1965 Housing and Urban Development bill. It provides as follows, and it relates to rental of private existing housing for public housing purposes:

The provisions of this section shall not apply to any locality unless the governing body of the locality has by resolution approved the application of such provisions to such locality.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; but that is in the Housing Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is in the Housing Act, but it is similar to the provision in the bill just passed. I merely call attention to the analogy.

Mr. PASTORE. It amounts to approximately the same thing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD telegrams I have received with respect to this proposal.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Eight hundred and forty-nine members of the Alabama State Homebuilders Association urge you to support funding of rent supplement programs Wednesday.

Rent supplement program is private enterprise and private home builder's last, best chance to provide good housing for low-income families under local government, not Federal public housing.

Your support is essential for private enterprise and all home builders.

THEO M. COMPTON,
President Alabama State Homebuilders Association.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
April 26, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Alabama Real Estate Association supports the rent supplement program and hopes you will lend every effort toward having the Senate appropriate sufficient funds to make it workable.

FRANK E. BUTLER, Jr., *President.*

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 26, 1966.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you support restoration of funds for FHA rent supplement program. Our association sincerely believes this program is far superior to public housing. Will be privately owned, subject to full local taxation and financed in private unsubsidized market. We are convinced that program will be far less costly than publicly owned tax-exempt public housing. FHA rent supplement program deserves chance to prove that it is effective device for housing low-income families.

JOHN C. WILLIAMSON,
National Association of Real Estate Boards.

ATLANTA, GA.,
April 27, 1966.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Private enterprise along with all of our members in your State and throughout the United States are in full support of the administration rent supplement bill now before Senate. We urge your support of this bill as your vote will be a vote for the poor people of the United States.

Q. V. WILLIAMSON,
President, National Association of Real Estate Brokers, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 26, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly urge your support of the motion to authorize initial appropriations to fund the essential rent supplement program for low-income families in accordance with the President's request.

NATHANIEL S. KEITH,
President, National Housing Conference.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
April 26, 1966.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Recommend a vote for rent supplement bill. Failure of this bill prevents nonprofit corporations building homes for the poor under title 221B.

Father PAUL DOWNEY,
Lady of Fatima Church.

Mr. PASTORE. I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 17, insert the following:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Included in the expenses of any functions of supervision which shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses, as stated in the third proviso under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, are expenses necessary for special studies of the savings and loan industry to be completed by December 31, 1968, including services as authorized by Section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) which may be of any duration not beyond such completion date.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this amendment does not provide for additional money. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board asked that it be authorized, within the law, to use $500,000 for a study of the savings and loan industry. In the beginning, this was opposed by many people within the industry. As a matter of fact, at the executive meeting the committee refused to accept the language, by a vote of the committee on the recommendation of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], because he thought the matter should be considered by his committee. Since then, he has studied the proposal and is convinced that it is a good one. He recommends it and supports the granting of the authority. For that reason I am now proposing this amendment.

I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to endorse what the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has said. Unfortunately, I was not informed of this matter, and the information came to me from the national organization, which thought that the investigation was to be punitive in nature. We learned, on the contrary, that it was to be a friendly, constructive investigation.

A panel composed of outstanding men already had been selected. They were in the field of economics, not in the savings and loan or banking business. They were students. They believed that their study could help a rapidly expanding industry.

The savings and loan men are remarkable. They have built millions of homes, and we want to promote their work. I held the matter up when I thought it was not to be a friendly investigation, but I learned that the investigation would be friendly. I found that no Federal appropriation will be involved, but that the industry will use some of its own money, which has been collected from premiums.

I endorse the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Special Study.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD SPECIAL STUDY—SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1966

1. The purpose of the proposed special study is to strengthen the savings and loan industry and the legal and regulatory framework within which it functions. The study would cover the following major fields: (a) The structure and operations of the

industry with emphasis upon its safety, (b) the supervisory functions of the Board and their streamlining and improvement, and (c) the operations of the bank system in extending advances to member institutions.

It is also anticipated that the role of the industry as a financial intermediary and its position in the money and capital markets, particularly in the light of recent developments, would be evaluated.

2. President Johnson requested Chairman Horne to undertake such a study at the time he asked Mr. Horne to serve as chairman of the Federal home loan bank board.

3. The design of the study and its implementation was worked out by the board in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget, and an exploration was made to see if economists of first rank could be obtained to advise on and conduct the study. Expressions of willingness to serve on an advisory panel were obtained from Dr. Frederick E. Balderston, University of California (formerly California savings and loan commissioner); Dr. Kermit E. Gordon, the Brookings Institution (formerly Director, Bureau of the Budget); and Prof. John Lintner, Harvard University. A tentative agreement to serve as director of research under the advisory panel was obtained from Prof. Irwin Friend, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. The participation of professional people of this caliber is essential to assure the greatest possible value from the study.

4. When these preliminaries had been completed, the President transmitted, as part of Senate Document No. 85, language to permit such a study to be conducted by the Board as part of its nonadministrative expenses. No appropriation of funds is involved, but simply the inclusion of this study under the existing limitations on expenditures of funds available to the Board for nonadministrative expenses.

5. It is understood that the Senate Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplements recommended adoption by the Committee on Appropriations of language to permit this study, in the form attached hereto as exhibit I.

6. The Senate Committee on Appropriations, in Report No. 1137 to accompany H.R. 14012, noted that: "At the request of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the committee denies the request without prejudice in order to allow consideration of this request by that committee."

7. Conducting of this study, in accordance with the request of the President, does not require new substantive legislation, but merely its inclusion through amendment in the existing language of limitation on Board nonadministrative expenses.

8. The chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is urged to request or permit floor amendment of the second supplemental appropriations bill to include the language approved by the Appropriations Subcommittee and state that, having received further information bearing on the matter, its previous objection is withdrawn.

Included in the expenses of any functions of supervision which shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses, as stated in the third proviso under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, are expenses necessary for special studies of the savings and loan industry to be completed by December 31, 1968, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) which may be of any duration not beyond such completion date.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 33, line 7, after "$38,000" insert the following: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966."

Mr. PASTORE. This is a conforming amendment. It is noncontroversial, and I move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a question arose about the language with regard to the Teacher Corps.

A statement was made by Mr. Howe on page 185 of the transcript of hearings on the second supplemental appropriations bill, and I should like to find out if the Senator in charge of the bill agrees with the statement made by Mr. Howe.

Mr. Howe was asked whether the payment of these funds that were indicated in the appropriation would be used during the training period for the payment of teachers' salaries.

Mr. Howe responded:

Our interpretation has been that the intent of the House was to have this language apply to payment of full salaries of teachers once they have gone into actual operation in a local school district and not to extend to the payment stipend while in training. That has been our interpretation and that was the basis for our earlier statement to you.

Senator PASTORE said: "I realize that."

Is that the interpretation of the Senator in charge of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. That is my understanding.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I have nothing further. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are several worthy items in this second supplemental appropriation bill which I recognize the need for and fully support. These meritorious items include additional funds for veterans' readjustment benefits, supplemental funds for vocational education and vocational student loan insurance fund, and additional badly needed funds for payments to federally impacted school districts under Public Law 874.

If these items were presented in a separate bill, there would be no hesitancy on my part in supporting them. However, on balance, considering the very undesirable items in this bill as a whole, I must vote against it.

I am particularly disappointed that the Senate failed to follow the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee in denying funds for the rent subsidy program. The Appropriations Committee exhibited much wisdom in denying funds for this program, after considering it very carefully and at some length in both open hearings and executive session. I opposed the legislation authorizing this program and I cannot support the appropriation now contained in this bill for the rent subsidies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open for further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent because of death in his immediate family, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] are detained on official business and, if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Aiken	Hruska	Morton
Allott	Inouye	Moss
Anderson	Jackson	Murphy
Bartlett	Javits	Muskie
Bass	Jordan, N.C.	Nelson
Bayh	Jordan, Idaho	Pastore
Brewster	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Prouty
Cannon	Lausche	Proxmire
Church	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Clark	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Cooper	Magnuson	Robertson
Curtis	Mansfield	Scott
Dominick	McCarthy	Smith
Douglas	McClellan	Sparkman
Ervin	McGee	Symington
Fong	McGovern	Talmadge
Fulbright	McIntyre	Tower
Gore	Metcalf	Tydings
Hart	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Monroney	Yarborough
Hill	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Holland	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—12

Bennett	Fannin	Simpson
Cotton	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Dirksen	Miller	Thurmond
Eastland	Mundt	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—16

Bible	Ellender	Russell, S.C.
Boggs	Gruening	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, Va.	Harris	Saltonstall
Carlson	Hayden	Smathers
Case	McNamara	
Dodd	Neuberger	

So the bill (H.R. 14012) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Senators PASTORE, HOLLAND, HAYDEN, RUSSELL of Georgia, ELLENDER, HILL, YOUNG of North Dakota, SALTONSTALL, and MUNDT.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 14012 the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make technical and typographical corrections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the passage of the second supplemental appropriation which includes the funding of the rent supplement program and the Teachers Corps through the end of this fiscal year, the Senate today witnessed an exemplary demonstration of great skill and undaunted conviction by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] whose flawless management of the measure, more than anything, assured success.

But the highly able handling of the measure was only typical of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals. For when he backs a measure he does so with all of his boundless energy, with all of his superb eloquence, and with all of his able capacities. Today's success is ample testimony to the great achievements which can be obtained when those capacities are devoted to a single objective. Success is a certainty and the Senate is grateful indeed.

But, as is usually the case, many, many Senators are to be commended for their vigorous support and their fine contributions to today's success. Among them are the distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], both of whom were strong and articulate in their support. Similarly the Senators from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and Oregon [Mr. MORSE] backed the measure with their typically able advocacy. Moreover, the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] earned high marks for their splendid efforts in its behalf.

And to those Senators who rose to oppose the supplemental or parts of the appropriation or to question its effect we owe our gratitude for their selflessness and cooperation in assisting to bring unimpeded and orderly Senate action. I am referring to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], to both Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and, of course, to the astute minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

To the Senate as a whole I express my sincere thanks for the cooperation they have afforded the leadership in expediting this measure.

THE HANFORD DUAL-PURPOSE REACTOR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, start-up of the 800,000-kilowatt Hanford atomic steamplant April 8 represents a victory for perseverance over adversity, for conservation over waste, and for the cooperative approach to developing our region's resources.

This is a significant and important step in putting the resources of the atom to work for the citizens of the State of Washington and the Nation. The Hanford dual-purpose nuclear steamplant, which is the world's largest atomic powerplant, began producing the first of an eventual 800,000 kilowatts of power which will be integrated into the Bonneville system. When this facility went on the line, it was a victory for conservation over waste, for the cooperative approach to resource development, and for perseverance in the face of many disappointments.

The history of the Hanford dual-purpose plant began in 1958, when Congress authorized the new production reactor—NPR. It was intended that convertibility features would be built into this plutonium-producing facility so that byproduct steam could be used to produce electric power.

In 1961, the northwest congressional delegation, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and others, asked Congress to provide funds for a Federal steam plant to use this byproduct steam for the production of electric power. There was strong objection to this proposal from other congressional delegations.

At that point, a group of public utility districts in my State of Washington, organized as the Washington Public Power Supply System, came forward with a proposal to finance, construct and operate the plant. This plan did not involve the use of Federal funds. What it did use was the steam produced at the federally operated Hanford plant to add 800,000 kilowatts of power—more than the output of Bonneville Dam—to the power supply of the Northwest.

On August 1, 1962, the Senate passed the AEC's authorization bill which contained an authorization for the Hanford generating plant. A conference committee with the House retained the steam plant authorization; and the conference report was accepted on September 14, 1962.

Passage of the authorization represented a victory for the supporters of Hanford in the Congress, for the WPPSS, and for its able managing director, Owen W. Hurd. Passage, in addition, has given the people of the Northwest a valuable power asset, which was obtained by the perseverance of those who labored to make Hanford a reality.

VICTORY FOR CONSERVATION

The generation of power from Hanford this month also represented a victory for conservation. Production of plutonium inevitably creates, as a byproduct, vast quantities of steam. The steam could have been wasted into the Columbia River—thereby raising the temperature of the water and raising the possibility of damage to fish resources—or it could be harnessed to produce electricity.

Because it is being harnessed, we are making good public use of a valuable resource, and the U.S. Treasury will receive in payments for this byproduct steam a large portion of the cost of the new production reactor.

It has been estimated that, if Hanford's NPR continues to produce plutonium for the next 24 years, WPPSS will pay the Atomic Energy Commission some $125 million for the byproduct steam—$125 million out of the total cost of the NPR of $195 million. So the power users in the Northwest will be making an important contribution to the Treasury by using electricity from Hanford.

Owen Hurd and WPPSS deserve congratulations, not only for having financed and built this giant plant, but also for having done so at about $20 million under the original cost estimates. The costs of Hanford's output are being averaged into rates charged by Bonneville Power Administration which is marketing the power under a three-way agreement, and this $20 million savings will have an important impact upon power costs in the region.

COOPERATIVE APPROACH TO RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

This three-way agreement is unique. The output of Hanford will go not only to the 16-member utility districts of WPPSS but to 76 electric utilities, 71 publicly owned, and 5 privately owned. Bonneville will deliver the power over its backbone grid system. This represents an important step toward greater cooperation among the utilities which serve the electric consumers of the Pacific Northwest, and one which will have important ramifications for the future.

This is also one of the outstanding examples of cooperation in a region that is far ahead of the Nation in practical and harmonious relations between public and private power. Supplying the region's needs for electric energy has evolved in a cooperative effort involving, first, the Federal agencies which construct and operate multipurpose water resource projects, second, BPA, which serves as the transmission and marketing agent for these Federal projects, and third, the region's 112 electric utilities, which include publicly, cooperatively, and privately owned systems. This diversity of ownership avoids the crippling effects of monopoly and is more responsive to public and consumer interest. It allows each segment of the industry to have a voice in decisions, to demonstrate what it can contribute, and to provide a system of checks and balances. The pattern that has evolved allows each segment to do what it can do best, thereby providing

the most efficient and economic overall operation.

FUTURE THERMAL GENERATION

Our area will have to begin adding large amounts of thermal generation within less than the next 10 years in order to keep up with fast-moving residential and industrial loads.

Bonneville Administrator Charles F. Luce, in a recent speech to the Northwest Public Power Association, declared that if all of the presently authorized, licensed, or recommended hydro projects are constructed on present schedules, the region will be able to meet its load growth only through 1975–76. So by 1975 the region must seek sources of electricity in addition to hydro—at the rate of about 1.5 million kilowatts per year.

This means steamplants; plants fired by coal from Cle Elum, Centralia, Montana, or Canada, or by atomic fuel. These plants increasingly will carry the base load, take care of the 24-hour needs of the people, while stored water behind the hydro plants will be released at times of peak need. This will make hydroelectric peaking power more valuable than ever before.

But if we are contemplating the addition of a million and a half kilowatts of power each year after 1975, clearly atomic power is going to account for a large share of this capacity.

Presently, the people of the Northwest, because of an abundance of hydroelectric sites, are enjoying the benefits of low-cost power in abundant quantities. This power has enabled us to meet the needs of population and industrial growth. In the future, according to the recent National Power Survey of the Federal Power Commission, reductions in the cost of processing nuclear fuels and building costs will make nuclear generation competitive in nearly all parts of the country. The citizens of the Northwest, and of the Nation, will continue to enjoy the benefits of reasonably priced power as the challenges of growth are met.

The Hanford dual-purpose project is also a hopeful step in utilizing facilities which had as their initial purpose the building of our Nation's defense. If the nuclear nations of the world ever agree on a disarmament plan which would suspend the production of material used in the producing nuclear weapons, the Hanford plant will still be generating electrical power for peaceful purposes.

This makes the Hanford project a pioneer installation, and one which will have important lessons for us in the Northwest as new nuclear plants reach the drawing boards. With the coming of new methods of generation, more cooperation and imaginative planning will be required if the power needs of the future are to be met. Hanford is a most important step in continuing the highest use of our national resources.

Moreover, the pattern of cooperative development exemplified by the Hanford atomic steamplant may well prove to be our most valuable asset in accomplishing the monumental tasks ahead. I am proud to be a part of this team.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at 5:52 p.m., Friday, April 8, the first power from the Hanford Steam Electric Generating Plant flowed into the Bonneville Power Administration system. It was only 25,000 kilowatts, but even that small initial amount meant that the Hanford plant was "go." Today, 200,000 kilowatts are flowing continuously into the Bonneville system. By this fall the amount will be the full 800,000-kilowatt capacity of the plant, or the equivalent of two Bonneville dams.

The Hanford atomic steamplant marks the fruition of years of effort to assure another peaceful use for the awesome might of the atom that buttresses our Nation's defense. It marks the fulfillment of the hopes and faith of the people of the Northwest, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Washington Public Power Supply System and the Congress that the byproduct steam of the new production reactor at Hanford need not be wasted, but instead used for the benefit of man. And, in many ways, it is a turning point in the power history of the Northwest.

First, the Hanford plant assures that the Pacific Northwest will not face a firm power shortage next fall and winter. The power supply situation in the region during the 1966–67 water season will be touch and go. Under critical water conditions, only with Hanford can the firm power demands on the BPA system be met, and even then certain emergency steps will have to be taken. If water conditions are median, the Hanford plant also will make it possible for BPA to serve its interruptible loads through the year.

Second, the Hanford plant has opened a new era of industrial growth in the region—industrial expansion that might have gone abroad but for the assured supply of low-cost power that Hanford provides. I recall that in 1961 BPA had large surpluses of firm power that it would have liked to sell to industries—and industries were knocking at the BPA door. But this surplus of power was only temporary—it had to be held for load growth of preference customers because there was no new power scheduled to come on the line in time to meet that load growth. Only Hanford could be brought on the ilne in time, and there was great hope that if Hanford were approved it would free some of the then-surplus power for industrial growth.

I recall the consternation and discouragement that hit BPA's potential industrial customers when our efforts failed in 1961 to gain authorization for a Federal steamplant to utilize the byproduct steam from the NPR. Industrial inquiries fell off to zero as industries made plans to go elsewhere for lack of Northwest power. Some, in fact, went abroad.

Then, in 1962, when Congress approved the arrangement by which Washington Public Power Supply System would finance, build, and operate the steamplant through agreements with the AEC and BPA, there was a dramatic upturn in industrial interest in the Pacific Northwest. Industries took the authorization not only as assurance of a limited amount of firm power available for them, but also as a sign that the Federal power system was going to grow again and that there would be more power available for industry.

Industrial inquiries multiplied. Then came completion of the Canadian Treaty and several new Federal hydro starts. As a result, in the past 3 years, BPA has contracted or committed more than 1 million kilowatts of firm power to industry—the greatest industrial spurt in the history of BPA.

Third, the Hanford atomic steamplant is the first large steamplant whose operation is being integrated into the all-hydro-operation of the Columbia River power system for which BPA markets power. Thus it is a pioneer plant not only in terms of its dual purpose nature, but also in terms of utility operations in the Pacific Northwest.

Fourth, and finally, the Hanford atomic steamplant marks the start of the transition of the Pacific Northwest from an all-hydropower operation to a combination of steamplants to carry baseload growth and hydro for peaking. By 1975, approximately, all the region's economic hydro to carry baseload will have been developed. Economic hydro for peaking purposes can be installed until about the year 2000. By 1975 the region's load growth will be about 1.5 million kilowatts on peak and about 900,000 kilowatts of average energy. By 1975, then, the region will need the equivalent of a new Hanford atomic steamplant, or more, every year.

This will be a difficult transition, and the experience our region gains from integrating the output of the Hanford atomic steamplant into its hydropower operation will prove most valuable.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in both the Senate and the House to congratulate Owen Hurd and the Washington Public Power Supply System, Charles F. Luce and the Bonneville Power Administration, and the 76 participating privately and publicly owned utilities on this historic occasion, and to thank my colleagues in both Houses for their foresight and wisdom in authorizing this, the world's largest atomic steamplant.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to join with my good friends, the distinguished Senators from the State of Washington, in proper recognition of the national contribution which the Hanford atomic steamplant is now making.

This tremendous installation, which is the world's largest of its kind, represents impressive evidence to all the world of the great gift to peace and industry which the atom is capable of rendering. There is more involved here than just another source of power for the Northwest. The huge production which will be realized will be an important addition to the power available to the intertie system. It will augment the power capability of the Northwest to meet its growing needs at a cost which will insure the future prosperity of industry in the area. It comes at a time when the hydroelectric resources are being tapped nearly to capacity.

My own State of Nevada looks forward to the beneficial effects of the intertie

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14012

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 27, 1966

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, namely:

~~(1)~~*CHAPTER I*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund," $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER ~~(2)~~ *II*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" for the general fund, $1,250,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including $3,700 for disbursement by the administrative office of the United States courts for expenses of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, $1,249,200, of which $111,600 shall be payable from the highway fund, $200 from the water fund, and $200 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", $210,600.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year involved.

(3)*CHAPTER III*

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Asian Development Bank

For subscriptions to the Asian Development Bank, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, to remain available until expended, $140,000,000, of which $20,000,000 shall be available for the first installment on paid-in capital stock, $20,000,000 shall be available for the second in-

stallment on such stock, and $100,000,000 shall be available for the entire subscription to callable capital stock.

CHAPTER ~~(4) II~~ *IV*

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

~~(5)~~*National Capital Housing Authority*

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance of properties", $12,000.

Selective Service System

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses". ~~(6) $10,180,000~~ *$12,681,000.*

Veterans Administration

~~(7)~~*GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES*

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", $3,000,000.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", $288,000,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", including not to exceed $75,000 for the purposes of section 5 of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–41), (8)~~$15,000,000~~ *$75,000,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

rent supplement program

For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $100,000: *Provided,* That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000: *Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for com-

munity improvement meeting the requirements of section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451 (c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

(9) *Federal Home Loan Bank Board*

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Included in the expenses of any functions of supervision which shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses, as stated in the third proviso under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, are expenses necessary for special studies of the savings and loan industry to be completed by December 31, 1968, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), which may be of any duration not beyond such completion date.

CHAPTER (10) ~~III~~ *IV*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $1,495,000.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", $755,000.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", (11)~~$1,028,000~~ *$1,245,000*.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", (12)~~$827,000~~ *$892,000*.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", (13)~~$900,000~~ *$1,711,000*, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)", $5,500,000, to remain available until expended.

(14)*OFFICE OF TERRITORIES*

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Administration of Territories", $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", (15)~~$148,000~~ *$193,000*.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", (16)~~$658,000~~ *$712,700*.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For additional amounts for "Forest protection and utilization", as follows:

"Forest land management", $9,635,000;

"Forest research", $610,000; and

"State and private forestry cooperation", $45,000.

(17)*FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW*

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $18,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", (18)~~$18,000~~ *$68,000*.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For an additional amount for "Transitional grants to Alaska", $876,000.

CHAPTER (19) ~~IV~~ *VI*

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses of worker adjustment assistance allowances and for administration of adjustment assistance services to workers as provided in Title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-794), and Title III of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-283), $1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses," $1,028,000, of which $821,900 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" and $206,100 may be expended from

the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

Wage and Labor Standards

wage and hour division, salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", $614,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

expansion and improvement of vocational education

For an additional amount for "Expansion and improvement of vocational education", for advances for reserve funds and interest payments on insured loans under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, $950,000, (20) *of which $100,000 for interest payments shall remain available until expended and $850,000 for advances shall remain available until June 30, 1968.*

vocational student loan insurance fund

For the vocational student loan insurance fund created by section 13 of the National Vocational Student Loan

Insurance Act of 1965 (70 Stat. 1046), $50,000, to remain available until expended.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Elementary and secondary educational activities", for meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children under title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, $184,000,000, (21) *to be available from March 1, 1966, and all obligations incurred during the period from such date to the date of enactment of this Act, are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the authorization for the purpose* (22): *Provided, That in addition whenever the Commissioner of Education shall have approved an application for a project in accordance with said title II subject to the amount of entitlements available to the States for such purpose, the cost of such project shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government.*

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher Educational Activities", $11,300,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for basic grants authorized in section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $1,000,000 shall be for training grants under section 223 of that Act, and $300,000 shall be for

transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials under part C of title II of that Act.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

For the National Teacher Corps authorized in part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, ~~$10,000,000~~ *$9,500,000*: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts", $41,000,000.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES

For an additional amount for "Grants to States", for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended. $39,000,000.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount for "National Library of Medicine", including carrying out the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1059), $4,175,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1967.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENT TO TRUST FUNDS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance trust funds, as authorized by sections 103 and 111 (d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and section 1844 of the Social Security Act, $125,800,000, of which $100,000,000 shall remain available through December 31, 1967, as authorized by section 1844.

PAYMENT FOR MILITARY SERVICE CREDITS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the Federal Disability Insurance, and the Federal Hospital Insurance trust funds, for benefit payments and other costs resulting from noncontributory coverage extended certain veterans as provided under section 217 (g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, $105,000,000.

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance", $381,000,000.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

GALLAUDET COLLEGE, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", $24,000.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Howard University, salaries and expenses", $216,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration", $13,000, together with not to exceed $53,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", $1,075,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

CHAPTER (24)~~V~~ *VII*

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

(25)*SENATE*

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and investigations", $200,000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Eva Hassell Bonner, widow of Herbert C. Bonner, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, $30,000.

For payment to Lera Millard Thomas, widow of Albert Thomas, late a Representative from the State of Texas, $30,000.

For payment to Mary I. Baldwin, widow of John F. Baldwin, late a Representative from the State of California, $30,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For an additional amount for "Capitol grounds", $17,000.

CHAPTER (26)~~VI~~ *VIII*

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Corps of Engineers—Civil

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", (27)~~$7,000,000~~ *$7,350,000*, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies", $7,750,000, to remain available until expended.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", $300,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $520,000, to remain available until expended.

(28)*BUREAU OF RECLAMATION*

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For an additional amount for "Upper Colorado River Basin fund", $1,400,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Loan program", Bureau of Reclamation.

CHAPTER (29)~~VII~~ *IX*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service", $450,000.

PAYMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, $45,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

(30)~~In addition to the amount heretofore made available in the appropriation under this head for the current fiscal year for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert~~

~~witnesses),~~ ~~not~~ ~~to~~ ~~exceed~~ ~~$25,000~~ ~~shall~~ ~~be~~ ~~available~~ ~~in~~ ~~such~~ ~~appropriation~~ ~~for~~ ~~such~~ ~~compensation~~ ~~and~~ ~~expenses.~~

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses", including not to exceed $25,000 for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", fiscal year 1966.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", $475,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PATENT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $1,000,000.

(31) *1967 ALASKA CENTENNIAL*

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Alaska Centennial Act of 1966, including administrative expenses, to remain available until June 30, 1968, $4,600,000, of which not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for grants to the State of Alaska, and not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a

part of the Centennial celebration.

(32) *INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES*

INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

For expenses necessary to conduct the studies and submit the reports, and for related expenses, required by section 2(b) of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89–355), as to the proposed participation by the United States, by foreign countries, and industry in Interama, $160,000, to remain available until expended.

THE JUDICIARY

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", $200,000.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and commissioners", $1,165,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $425,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Civil rights educational activities," including not to exceed $225,000 for salaries and expenses, $3,000,000.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $500,000.

CHAPTER (33)~~VIII~~ *X*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Operations", (34)~~$269,904,000~~ *$294,904,000*.

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for "Transportation", $21,000,000.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", $3,106,000.

CHAPTER (35)~~IX~~ *XI*

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in (36)*Senate Document Numbered 87 and* House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-ninth Congress, (37)~~$10,251,798~~ *$10,828,683*, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in said judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further,* That

unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

Legislative Branch

(38) *Senate:*

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators", $8,065;

"Salaries, officers and employees", $543,105;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", $7,425;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Senate policy committees", $9,940;

"Automobiles and maintenance", $840;

"Inquiries and investigations", $116,865, including $3,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;

"Folding documents", $945;

"Miscellaneous items", $32,065, including $16,200 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol

in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87–82, approved July 6, 1961;

Joint Items:

"Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures", $945, to remain available until expended;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Joint Economic Committee", $9,000;

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", $8,250;

"Joint Committee on Printing", $3,750;

Contingent expenses of the House:

"Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation", $10,530;

"Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy", $655;

"Joint Committee on Defense Production", $2,160;

House:

"Compensation of Members", $7,500;

"Office of the Speaker", $3,155;

"Office of the Parliamentarian", $2,755;

"Compilation of Precedents", $270;

"Office of the Chaplain", $410;

"Office of the Clerk", $41,230;

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms", $28,205;

"Office of the Doorkeeper", $43,745;

"Office of the Postmaster", $13,825;

"Committee employees", $103,000;

"Six minority employees", $3,175;

"Majority floor leader", $2,340;

"Minority floor leader", $1,940;

"Majority whip", $1,565;

"Minority whip", $1,565;

"Printing clerks", $430;

"Technical assistant to attending physician", $385;

"Official reporters of debates", $6,880;

"Official reporters to committees", $6,940;

"Legislative counsel", $7,970;

"Members' clerk hire", $770,000;

"Special and select committees". $100,000;

"Coordinator of information", $3,675;

"Revision of the laws", $730;

"Speaker's auto", $330;

"Majority leader's auto", $330;

"Minority leader's auto", $330;

"Miscellaneous items", $19,000, for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208

of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812);

Architect of the Capitol:

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", $13,900;

Capitol buildings and grounds:

"Capitol buildings", $40,000;

"Capitol grounds", $10,000;

(39) *"Senate office buildings", $31,000;*

"Senate garage", $600;

"Capitol power plant", $10,000;

"Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care", $13,000;

Botanic Garden: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000;

Library of Congress:

"Salaries and expenses", $256,700;

Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", $51,500;

Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", $62,200;

Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses", $65,300;

Books for the Blind: "Salaries and expenses", $6,600;

"Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)", $3,600;

Government Printing Office:

Office of Superintendent of Documents:

"Salaries and expenses": Not to exceed $65,000 of the reserve fund under this head for the current fiscal year may be used for increased pay costs authorized by law.

THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States:

"Salaries", $41,000;

"Care of Buildings and Grounds", $5,000;

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Customs Court: "Salaries and expenses", $19,000;

Court of Claims: "Salaries and expenses", $13,300;

Court of appeals; district courts, and other judicial services:

"Salaries of supporting personnel", $818,000;

"Administrative Office of the United States Courts", $31,000;

"Expenses of referees", $125,000, to be derived from the "Referees' salary and expense fund".

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The White House Office:

"Salaries and expenses", $85,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Special projects", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of the Budget: "Salaries and expenses", $131,000;

Council of Economic Advisers: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000;

National Security Council: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000;

Office of Emergency Planning: "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies", $86,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", fiscal year 1966;

Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic assistance:

"Administrative expenses", Agency for International Development, $980,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966;

"Administrative and other expenses", Department of State, $42,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service:

"Salaries and expenses", as follows:

"Research", $2,402,500; and

"Plant and animal disease and pest control", $1,268,500;

Cooperative State Research Service: "Payments and expenses", $32,000;

Extension Service: "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses": Of the amount made available under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, for "Payment to States and Puerto Rico", $64,000 shall be transferred to the subappropriation for "Federal Extension Service";

Farmer Cooperative Service: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

Soil Conservation Service:

"Conservation operations", $2,608,000:

"Watershed planning", $140,000, to remain available until expended;

"Watershed protection", $585,000, to remain available until expended;

"Flood prevention", $160,000, to remain available until expended;

"Great Plains conservation program", $82,000, to remain available until expended;

"Resource conservation and development", $46,000, to remain available until expended;

Economic Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", $246,000;

Statistical Reporting Service: "Salaries and expenses", $250,000;

Consumer and Marketing Service: "Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", $1,905,000;

Foreign Agricultural Service: "Salaries and expenses", $178,000;

Commodity Exchange Authority: "Salaries and expenses", $28,000;

Rural Electrification Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $268,000;

Farmers Home Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: "Administrative and operating expenses", $202,000;

Rural Community Development Service: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

Office of the Inspector General: "Salaries and expenses", $145,000;

Office of the General Counsel: "Salaries and expenses", $102,000;

Office of Information: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

National Agricultural Library: "Salaries and expenses", $36,000;

Office of Management Services: "Salaries and expenses", $59,000;

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000;

Forest Service: "Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)", $964,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $89,000 (40)*to be derived by transfer from the appropria-*

tion for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

Office of Business Economics: "Salaries and expenses", $50,000 (41) *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;*

Bureau of the Census:

"Salaries and expenses", $320,000 (42) *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", fiscal year 1966;*

"1964 Census of Agriculture", $110,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967 (43), *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", fiscal year 1966;*

Business and Defense Services Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $125,000 (44) *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;*

International Activities:

"Salaries and expenses", $160,000 (45) *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,* of which $23,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1967;

"Export control", $100,000 (46)*to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,* of which $33,400 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs;

Office of Field Services: "Salaries and expenses", $90.000 (47)*to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

Coast and Geodetic Survey: "Salaries and expenses", $510,000;

National Bureau of Standards: "Research and technical services", $500,000 (48)*to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

Weather Bureau:

"Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000 (49)*of which $754,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statitstics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

"Research and development", $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968;

"Meteorological satellite operations", $48,000, to remain available until expended;

Maritime Administration:

"Salaries and expenses", $222,000 (50) *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*, of which $200,000 is for administrative expenses and $22,000 is for reserve fleet expenses;

"Maritime training", $38,000 (51) *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966*;

Bureau of Public Roads: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $950,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administration and research).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Military personnel:

"Military personnel, Army", $222,100,000;

"Military personnel, Navy", $182,600,000;

"Military personnel, Marine Corps", $42,400,000;

"Military personnel, Air Force", $227,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Navy", $4,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", $1,600,000;

"Reserve personnel, Air Force", $1,200,000;

"National Guard personnel, Army", $4,500,000;

"National Guard personnel, Air Force", $3,500,000;

"Retired pay, Defense", $71,000,000;

Operation and maintenance:

"Operation and maintenance, Army", $33,400,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Navy", $23,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", $1,054,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air Force", $27,600,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", $14,356,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", $2,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard", $1,000,000;

"Court of Military Appeals, Defense", $11,000.

(52) *ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION*

The limitation contained in section 606 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1966 on the funds available for the operation of overseas dependents schools is hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by Public Law 89-391.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army:

Cemeterial expenses: "Salaries and expenses", $67,000;

Corps of Engineers—Civil: "General expenses", $385,000;

Ryukyu Islands, Army: "Administration", $40,000;

The Panama Canal:

Panama Canal Company: "Limitation on general and administrative expenses" (increase of $137,000 in the limitation on the amount available for general and administrative expenses);

United States Soldiers' Home: "Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay" (increase of $146,000 in the amount available for maintenance and operation to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service:

"Hospitals and medical care", $770,000;

"Foreign quarantine activities", $212,000;

"Indian health activities", $1,355,000;

Saint Elizabeths Hospital: "Salaries and expenses", the

total amount available for "Salaries and expenses" in the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966", is hereby increased from $29,886,000 to $30,613,000;

Social Security Administration: "Limitation on salaries and expenses, Social Security Administration" (increase of $8,037,000 in the amount to be expended, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein);

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $18,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund;

"Surplus property utilization", $20,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Federal Housing Administration: "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration" (53) ~~(increases of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses)~~ *(increase of $575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses)*; administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses);

Public Housing Administration:

"Administrative expenses", $405,000;

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Public Housing Administration" (increase of $405,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses).

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs:

"Education and welfare services", $1,202,400;

"General administrative expenses", $103,000;

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Office of Territories: "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands", $102,600;

Mineral Resources:

Geological Survey: "Surveys, investigations, and research", $1,510,000;

Bureau of Mines:

"Conservation and development of mineral resources", $500,000;

"Health and safety", $92,000;

"General administrative expenses", $22,000;

Office of Oil and Gas: "Salaries and expenses", $16,300;

Fish and Wildlife Service:

Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: "Salaries and expenses", $8,500;

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

"Management and investigation of resources", $86,800, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development", fiscal year 1966;

"General administrative expenses", $15,000;

"Administration of Pribilof Islands", $10,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: "General administrative expenses", $34,300;

National Park Service: "General administrative expenses", $57,000;

Bureau of Reclamation: "General administrative expenses", $241,200, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operation and maintenance", fiscal year 1966;

Bonneville Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $173,000;

Southwestern Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $25,300;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $109,800;

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $105,000;

Office of Water Resources Research: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration:

Alien property activities: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $7,000 in the amount for general administrative expenses);

"Salaries and expenses, antitrust division", $45,000;

"Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", $647,000;

Federal Bureau of Investigation: "Salaries and expenses", $3,735,000;

Immigration and Naturalization Service: "Salaries and expenses", $1,782,000;

Federal Prison System: "Salaries and expenses", $1,035,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration:

Office of Manpower Administrator: "Salaries and expenses", $66,000, to be derived by transfer from the

appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Manpower development and training activities", $25,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training: "Salaries and expenses", $87,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Wage and Labor Standards:

Bureau of Labor Standards: "Salaries and expenses", $39,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Women's Bureau: "Salaries and expenses", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Employees' Compensation: "Salaries and expenses", $58,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for

Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $1,550 to be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 944);

Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Salaries and expenses", $242,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of International Labor Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," fiscal year 1966;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $3,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, unemployment trust fund;

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $35,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Federal contract compliance program", $7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

"Administration and regional operation", $1,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,760,000, of which $1,299,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966, and $123,600 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Extension and remodeling, State Department Building";

International organizations and conferences: "Missions to international organizations", $59,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966;

International commissions:

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: "Salaries and expenses", $17,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $138,000;

Bureau of Customs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,043,000;

Bureau of Narcotics: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

Bureau of the Public Debt: "Administering the public debt", $360,000;

Coast Guard:

"Operating expenses", $9,400,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966;

"Retired pay", $1,000,000;

"Reserve training", $1,050,000;

Internal Revenue Service:

"Salaries and expenses", $381,000;

"Revenue accounting and processing", $3,472,000;

"Compliance", $9,305,000;

Office of the Treasurer: "Salaries and expenses", $60,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

United States Secret Service: "Salaries and expenses, guard force", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, United States Secret Service", fiscal year 1966.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

"Operations", (54) ~~$9,500,000~~ *$8,000,000*;

"Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport", $54,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport", $62,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", $4,600,000;

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service", $861,000, of which $55,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966;

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", $336,000;

"Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service", $135,000, of which $45,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966, and $90,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966:

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", $33,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"General operating expenses", $1,000,000;

"Medical and prosthetic research", $365,000;

"Medical care", $17,456,000.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Civil Aeronautics Board: "Salaries and expenses", $240,000;

Civil Service Commission:

"Salaries and expenses", $528,000, and in addition $15,000 may be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations";

"Limitation on administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund" (increase of $6,200 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Farm Credit Administration: "Limitation on administrative expenses" (increase of $28,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: "Salaries and expenses", $1,500;

Federal Communications Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $346,000;

Federal Home Loan Bank Board:

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (increase of $75,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation" (increase of $6,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Federal Maritime Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: "Salaries and expenses", $115,000;

Federal Power Commission: "Salaries and expenses". $300,000;

Federal Trade Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $312,500;

General Accounting Office: "Salaries and expenses", $535,000;

Intergovernmental commissions:

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Interstate Commerce Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $625,000;

National Labor Relations Board: "Salaries and expenses", $548,100;

National Mediation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $27,000;

Renegotiation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $30,000;

Small Business Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $150,000;

Smithsonian Institution:

"Salaries and expenses", $453,000;

"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", $66,000;

Tariff Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $46,000;

Tax Court of the United States: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

United States Information Agency: "Salaries and expenses", $1,005,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

Operating expenses:

"General operating expenses", $325,800, of which $4,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $1,400 from the motor vehicle parking account),

$800 from the water fund, and $100 from the sanitary sewage works fund;

"Health and welfare", $920,500;

"Highways and traffic", $95,900, of which $78,000 shall be payable from the highway fund;

"Sanitary engineering", $253,000, of which $59,300 shall be payable from the water fund and $20,700 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1966.

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 202. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1966, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Passed the House of Representatives March 29, 1966.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments April 27, 1966.

Attest: EMERY L. FRAZIER,
Secretary.

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 14012

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 27, 1966

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 4, 1966
For actions of May 3, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 73

CONTENTS

Acreage.....34
Adjournment.....15
Appropriations.....16,26
Claims.....17
Colleges of agriculture.26
Commodity exchange.....32
Conservation fees.....23
Cotton.....34
Education.....6,38
Electrification....5,25,28
Employment.....24
Excess property.....27
Extension work.....14
Farm labor.....33
Farm policy.....18
Farm program.....10,18
Federal aid.....19
Fees and charges.....23
Fish protein.....30
Food.....11
Food prices.....33
Food reserves.....39
Foreign aid.....27
Information.....20
Labeling.....37
Legislative process.....9
Loan pools.....1
Loans.....1,3
Manpower.....31,41
Oceanic research.....12
Opinion poll.....21
Participation sales.....1
Personnel.....24,29
Population crisis.....11
Poverty.....4,22
Recreation.....8
Research.....12,14,19,35
School milk.....2
Small business.....3
Supplemental appropriations.....16
Transportation.....36
Veterans' benefits.....38
Water pollution.....7,13
Watersheds.....13
Wetlands.....40
Wildlife.....40

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Yarborough praised House restoration of funds for extension work. Sen. Fulbright urged restoration of budget items for soil and water conservation. Sen. Hruska criticized Secretary Freeman's statement on farm prices. Senate debated sales participation bill. Sen. Pearson introduced and discussed food and fiber reserve bill. Rep. Fino introduced and discussed commodity cost control bill. Reps. Arends and Langen criticized USDA farm policy.

SENATE

1. PARTICIPATION SALES. Began debate on S. 3283, to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies. pp. 9135-48

2. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire commended the House for its restoration of funds for the school milk program. pp. 9107-7

3. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Scott spoke in favor of S. 2729, to increase the ceiling on Small Business Administration revolving fund, and inserted the President's

signing statement. pp. 9109-10

4. POVERTY. Sen. Scott commended and inserted an editorial, "Poverty Program Impoverished." p. 9128

5. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Gruening commended and inserted an article explaining "the great importance to the United States and the Nation of constructing the great Rampart Dam on the Yukon River." pp. 9132-33

6. EDUCATION. Received a GAO report on the limited success in obtaining contributions for the binational educational exchange program. p. 9066

7. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Inouye requested that numerous cosponsors be added to S. 3240, to provide for a study and investigation of estuaries and estaurine zones of the U. S. p. 9087

8. RECREATION. Sen. Metcalf inserted a comparison of the suitability of the Redwood Creek and Mill Creek areas as locations for a Redwood National Park. pp. 9133-35

9. LEGISLATIVE PROCESS. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., discussed the role of the House Rules Committee in the legislative process, describing the committee as "a good scapegoat and a scapegoat good for responsible government," and inserted a law student's paper on the subject. pp. 9094-8

10. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Hruska criticized administration's farm program and inserted editorials supporting his views. pp. 9162-3

11. POPULATION; FOOD. Sens. Gruening and Yarborough inserted a speech by the chairman of the Population Crisis Committee offering a five-point program to meet the world food and population crisis. pp. 9128-30, 9166-8

12. OCEANIC RESEARCH. Sen. Inouye inserted an editorial discussing Hawaii's science and research program in which it is suggested that the oceans may be cultivated as a rich new source of both animal and vegetable food. pp. 9171-2

13. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Hart commended the Federal-State-local cooperation in water pollution control in Michigan. p. 9168

Sen. Fulbright urged acceleration of the watershed program by increasing the appropriation for watershed planning and operations, and by eliminating the restrictions on new planning and new starts. p. 9172

14. RESEARCH; EXTENSION WORK. Sen. Yarborough stated that he deplored the proposed cuts in this Department's budget and inserted resolutions of Texas A & M urging restoration of funds for extension and agricultural research programs. p. 9176

15. ADJOURNED until Thurs., May 5. p. 9185

HOUSE

16. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 14012, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1966, and consent was granted for the filing of a report by midnight Thurs., May 5. p. 9186

Reportedly, Davies was a member of the Young Communist League of the Communist Party in Hartford, Conn., in the 1920's.

Davis' wife, the former Julia Gaberman, is reported to have worked for the Soviet Government Trading Agency, AMTORG. In August 1951, she was suspended without pay by the New York City Department of Welfare for refusing to appear at an inquiry into her Communist activities; and she was dismissed from her welfare department, as a social worker, in October 1951.

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is living high off the hog today. The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is not exactly poverty-stricken but it is one of the major beneficiaries of the Federal poverty program.

The OEO probably knows, and if it does not know it should know, that some of the activities OEO is supporting in Mississippi are doing more to help the Communist-inspired Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party than to help underprivileged children, or the truly needy.

The OEO probably knows, and if it does not know it should know, that so-called "freedom schools" in Mississippi, under the same general control as the group to which the organization has just given over $5 million, have been teaching the techniques of draft dodging, and the evils of this country's policy in Vietnam.

The OEO probably knows, and if it does not know it should know, that one Freedom School teacher who came to Macomb, Miss., from Chicago has publicly admitted that he taught his pupils that the U.S. Air Force in Vietnam is careful to drop bombs on colored people instead of on white people.

The OEO probably knows, and if it does not know it should know, that one of the founders of the so-called "freedom schools" in Mississippi went to North Vietnam in January of this year for a conference with Ho Chi Minh. That man's name is Staughton Lynd. He took with him to Hanoi another so-called "civil rights activist" who participated in the Mississippi invasion, namely Thomas Hayden, who is also a founder of "Students for a Democratic Society," which is another subversive organization that opposes our Government's efforts.

If you think they are using all of that money only to fight poverty, you are not getting adequate and accurate reports.

A recent meeting of the so-called Freedom Party in Jackson, Miss., provided a classic example of how easily a federally financed program can be made to serve purposes hardly consistent with either what Congress intended to authorize, or even with the most basic democratic principles.

This meeting, billed as the second anniversary meeting of the Freedom Party, was attended by several employees of the Child Development Group, a Headstart program backed by the Delta ministry. This Headstart program I have mentioned in past remarks. A year ago they had the industry to spend over $2 million in a 6-week span, and the accounting for this expenditure is still not complete. On numerous occasions it was discovered that these Headstart funds were used to post bond for so-called civil rights workers arrested for violations of the law.

I will not now take the time to repeat the mountain of evidence about improper activities of the Child Development Group.

This grant was approved even after the Delta Ministry helped sponsor the invasion of the Greenville Air Force Base. The Justice Department declined to bring charges for the crimes committed by this action, claiming they were "petty."

The mere attendance of employees of this group, whose salaries are being paid out of a $5 million grant from OEO, is alone not to be censored. They have the right, as citizens, to participate in political activity. The attendance of these employees is, however, interesting from two other standpoints.

First, they arrived at this meeting in three new cars owned by the Child Development Group and purchased by Federal funds. Certainly attendance of a nighttime political gathering is not official business for a Headstart program.

These cars, two new Plymouths and a new Ford, were certainly not purchased by the taxpayers to provide transportation to the Freedom Party.

Abraham Wells, the driver of one of the cars, who is a Child Development Group employee, has attended similar meetings before driving these cars.

I have it on the best authority that these Headstart program employees have been told pointedly by the leaders of Freedom Party that if they wish to remain employed as area administrators at $120 per week, or as paid teachers, they must actively support the Freedom Party.

Nor is this an idle threat. George Raymond, who is on the board of directors of the Child Development Group, is also a Freedom Party officer. In fact, he is campaign manager for the Freedom Party's candidate for the Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. President, if those responsibile can get away with spending for political purposes, and especially for the political uses of persons of subversive intent, a portion of the $5 million granted to this Child Development Group, there is no telling how their success could aid the Communists not merely in Mississippi, but everywhere in the Nation where such infiltration can be successful.

Mr. President, this is not a completely isolated situation. In a way, it is typical. My State is greatly troubled.

Most of the trouble is caused by persons from outside Mississippi, many of them brought into the State by one or another of the many programs and projects which make up a large part of the facade of the new Mississippi invasion.

Classified employees of the Federal Government are not wholly blameless with respect to the fomentation of racial strife, but temporary employees, and consultants, and those who get Federal money through some sort of an intermediary cause far more trouble.

It would be a great help in meeting this problem if there was only some way to control, or at least to screen, the influx of outsiders who live wholly or partly on Federal funds while they stoke the fires of racial conflict in Mississippi.

(At his point Mr. LONG of Louisiana took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as a move in this direction, I believe consideration should be given to limiting appropriated funds which Congress authorizes for the war on poverty so as to prohibit expenditure of any such moneys for salaries or expenses of any person who is not either a classified employee of the Federal Government, a top level executive of a Government department, or a qualified resident of the State in which such person is residing.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 5, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Valerian S. Karcz, national chaplain of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in the beginning didst command light to shine out of darkness, let the splendor of Thy truth and the glory of Thy goodness be reflected this solemn hour, in this historic forum of freedom in Washington, as we mark the anniversary date of Constitution Day of the Polish nation, enhanced in this, the year of the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

On the 3d of May, 1791, the Diet of Poland proceeded to pass a constitution recognizing the equality of all men and extending religious liberty to all, thereby giving to the world one of the great documents of freedom, like the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the American Declaration of Independence. Indeed, it was a symbol of the ideals of democracy and liberty. This significant fact would be reason enough to merit the good will of our great Nation, and Thy blessing, O Lord of nations. But permit us to enshrine this act in the eventful anniversary of the millennium of Christianity in Poland.

Thy providence which reaches from end to end mightily, and orders all things purposefully, did assign an important role to Poland in the year 966, on the day of baptism and in the hour of entrance into the stream of Western European civilization. The valiant people of that land, although harassed by invading hordes, although partitioned and sacrificed to the greed of totalitarian countries, never once failed to carry the cross, nor permitted the torch of freedom to be extinguished. Steadfast in their concept of freedom and of the dignity of the individual under God, they rightly won civilization's acclaim—"The bulwark of Christendom."

And so Heavenly Father, ruler of nations, in whose sight a thousand years are but as yesterday when it has passed, do Thou inspire us with the magnanimity to pause, in moments such as this, to pay tribute to a gallant member in the society of nations, and to hear our prayers that forever the chains of servitude be broken in the land of a courageous people.

Humbly we pray Thy blessing upon all gathered here, who in eagerness joined together, to celebrate another country's greatness. As Lord and Universal Father, who wills to make all men members of one family, help us to see in each other the image of God and the features of our brother, and in the spirit of Thy love effectively to obtain for every person, great or small, of whatever national origin or religious belief, the full and unhampered possession of his heritage. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today, the hearing on traffic safety.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14012) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, KIRWAN, PASSMAN, EVINS of Tennessee, DENTON, STEED, BOW, JONAS, and LAIRD.

AUTHORITY TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14012, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Thursday, May 5, to file the conference report on the bill H.R. 14012.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KREBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. KREBS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

STATE DEPARTMENT DOUBLETALK

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as all of us undoubtedly are, about the progress of events in Vietnam. Many steps have been taken to bring this problem to an early end.

That it is complex no one will question. However, adding to the complexity of the problem is the ambiguity of the answers we have so far received.

There are, in this welter of confusion, certain aspects that demand clarification, certain answers the State Department has refused to face up to, that are a bar to moving the conflict to the peace table where the ultimate solution will be found.

It is this diplomatic doubletalk that confuses our people and our adversaries as well. It is time for straight talk, to put on the line where we stand and our conditions for peace. The American people deserve to know where the administration is leading us—into the impenetrable jungle of war or into the fertile fields of peace.

One aspect that could easily be clarified today but which is clouded with uncertainty on both sides is with whom we will negotiate.

As an individual I know that you cannot stop a fight unless you get those involved to agree to stop. I for one believe we must consider all the belligerents in this action as peace table participants, not merely to have their views represented but to physically participate in the peace talks. Our State Department has indicated they see no objection to the NLF views being represented. For many months now in conversations with Ambassador Goldberg, Secretary Rusk, and other officials I have urged that the United States let the world know that we will engage in talks with all belligerents and concerned parties. And let us name the belligerents and concerned parties, including the NLF, Hanoi, and Communist China.

Let us get back to American straight talk and maybe someone will listen.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
T TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 6, 1966
For actions of May 5, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 75

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....14,24
Agricultural economics..20
Appropriations.....
.....7,15,23,26,42
Building.....45
Cheese imports.....21
Committee chairman.....3
Consumers.....22,29
Dairy support prices....21
Drug coordination.....8
Emergency credit.....15
Employment.....30
Freight cars.....23
arm labor.....11,34
Farm loans.....36
Farm prices.....4
Firefighters.....38
Fish protein.....32
Flood control.....18
Food for India.....10
Foreign trade.....5
4-H Club.....27
Housing.....48
Inflation.....12
Investigations.....16
Labor standards.....46
Legislative program..13,23
Loan pools.....1,23,41
Opinion poll.....28
Oyster planters.....36
Participation
sales.....1,23,41
Personnel.....30,37
Political activity.....30
Population.....40
Pork purchases.....4
Postal service.....44
Poverty.....9,43
Public works.....3
Research animals.....35
Retirement.....37
School milk.....7
Small business.....39
Soybeans.....47
Stockpiling.....17
Trails.....31
Transportation.....49
Unemployment.....25
Weather research.....2
Wetlands.....33
Wheat allotment.....4,6,19
Wildlife.....33

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed participation sales bill. House received conference report on 2nd supplemental appropriation bill.

SENATE

1. PARTICIPATION SALES. Passed, 39-22, with amendments the participation sales bill, S. 3283 (pp. 9445-76).

The committee report states:

"S. 3283 will permit the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, to sell to investors participation certificates based on a pool or pools of notes or other obligations representing loans made or otherwise acquired by Federal credit agencies. Sales of participation certificates on behalf of any agency must be specifically approved in advance in an appropriation act.

"Funds obtained from the sale of such participation certificates would be available to the respective agencies to meet loan demands to the extent of their authorized lending limits and any amounts not currently so used would reduce their outstanding borrowings or advances from the U. S. Treasury."

2. WEATHER RESEARCH. Received from the Commerce Department a report on weather-research progress and plans. p. 9392

3. COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN. Sen. Randolph was elected Chairman of the Public Works Committee. p. 9397

4. FARM PRICES. Sen. McGovern announced that 35 Senators have become cosponsors of his resolution intended to "end efforts to freeze or roll back farm prices which are below parity" and commended the decisions to resume pork purchases and to increase the wheat allotment. p. 9400

5. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Javits spoke in favor of discretionary authority for the President to extend "most favored nation" benefits to East European Communist countries. pp. 9405-6

6. WHEAT ALLOTMENT. Sen. Carlson announced and commended the President's decision to increase the wheat allotment. p. 9410

7. SCHOOL-MILK APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Proxmire commended the testimony of the National Farmers Union on school-milk appropriations. pp. 9414-5

8. DRUG COORDINATION. The Government Operations Committee submitted a report, "Interagency Drug Coordination" (p. 9396). Sen. Ribicoff discussed the report including comments regarding food additives. pp. 9426-8

9. POVERTY. Sen. Yarborough said Federal antipoverty programs are bypassing Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. pp. 9428-31

10. FOOD FOR INDIA. Sen. Mondale inserted articles on food needs in India. pp. 9437-8

11. FARM LABOR. Sen. Holland inserted a Farm Bureau recommendation for importation of farm laborers and deplored Secretary Wirtz' position on the matter. pp. 9444-5

12. INFLATION. Sen. Javits charged the administration with "drift and delay" on inflation. pp. 9478-81

13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield said defense and atomic-energy bills will be considered next week and that he hopes the Interior and Treasury-Post Office appropriation bills will also be ready. p. 9475

14. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 9. p. 9481

HOUSE

15. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 14012, the supplemental appropriation bill (H. Rept. 1476). The Senate item of $30,000,000 for the emergency credit revolving fund was reported in technical disagreement, but the House conferees said they will offer a motion to concur in the item. pp. 9497

For other USDA items see Digest 68.

89TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1476

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

MAY 5, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14012]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21, and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 53, and 54, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$12,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$1,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$65,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 9, 14, 25, 28, 30, 31, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52.

GEO. MAHON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
TOM STEED,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Chapter I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 1: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which provides $30,000,000 for the "Emergency credit revolving fund," Farmers Home Administration.

Chapter II

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 2: Changes chapter number.

Chapter III

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $140,000,000 for "Asian Development Bank" as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter IV

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 4: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $12,000 for the "National Capital Housing Authority" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $12,000,000 for the "Selective Service System" instead of $10,180,000 as proposed by the House and $12,681,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $1,000,000 for "General operating expenses" of the Veterans' Administration instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $65,000,000 for "Disaster relief" instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment authorizing use of nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for special studies, with an amendment limiting such expenses to $500,000.

Chapter V

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 10: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $1,028,000 for "Management and protection, National Park Service", as proposed by the House instead of $1,245,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $827,000 for "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities, National Park Service", as proposed by the House instead of $892,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $1,711,000 for "Construction, National Park Service", as proposed by the Senate instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to provide $2,500,000 for "Administration of territories, Office of Territories".

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $148,000 for "Management and investigations of resources, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries", as proposed by the House instead of $193,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $658,000 for "Management and investigations of resources, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife", as proposed by the House instead of $712,700 as proposed by the Senate.

RELATED AGENCIES

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $18,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $18,000 for "Salaries and expenses, National Capital Planning Commission", as proposed by the House instead of $68,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter VI

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Amendment No. 19: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 20: Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to the time periods during which the funds appropriated will be available.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22: Delete language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $9,500,000 for "National Teacher Corps", as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter VII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 24: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide $200,000 for "Inquiries and investigations", and $30,000 for payment to the widow of a deceased Senator.

Chapter VIII

PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 26: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $7,350,000 for "Operation and maintenance, General Corps of Engineers," as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to provide $1,400,000 for "Upper Colorado river storage project, Bureau of Reclamation."

Chapter IX

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 29: Changes chapter number.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which inserts an appropriation of $200,000 for "Fees and expenses of witnesses."

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which provides an appropriation of $4,600,000 for "1967 Alaska Centennial."

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $160,000 for "Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center" as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter X

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 33: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $294,904,000 for "Operations", as proposed by the Senate instead of $269,904,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter XI

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendment No. 35: Changes chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37: Appropriate $10,828,683 to pay for certain claims as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,251,798 as proposed by the House.

Title II

INCREASED PAY COSTS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Appropriate $750,850 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendments Nos. 40 through 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendments which provide that the funds are to be derived by transfer.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 53: Provides increase of $575,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of increase of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Geo. Mahon,
Michael J. Kirwan,
Otto E. Passman,
Joe L. Evins,
Winfield K. Denton,
Tom Steed,
Frank T. Bow,
Charles R. Jonas,
Melvin R. Laird,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

S. 1611, transfer of certain functions from the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 14205, preservation and use of Old Georgetown Market;

S. 2263, to provide for five additional judges for the District of Columbia court of general sessions;

H.R. 9824, to amend District of Columbia Life Insurance Act of 1934; and

H.R. 13703, Technical Amendments to District of Columbia Code.

Also on Monday there is scheduled for consideration the bill H.R. 14732, for fiscal year 1967.

For Tuesday, the program is as follows: The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1967.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

H.R. 14544, the Sales Participation Act of 1966; and

S. 2499, Sale of Participations in Small Business Administration Loan pools. Both this bill and the previous bill will be brought up, if rules are granted.

Also there is scheduled H.R. 14088, Military Medical Benefits Act of 1966, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

S. 1098, to alleviate national freight car shortage, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on H.R. 14012:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1476)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21, and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 53, and 54; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 9, 14, 25, 28, 30, 31, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52.

GEORGE MAHON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
TOM STEED,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which provides $30,000,000 for the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund," Farmers Home Administration.

CHAPTER II

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 2: Changes chapter number.

CHAPTER III

Foreign operations

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $140,000,000 for "Asian Development Bank" as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Independent offices

Amendment No. 4: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $12,000 for the "National Capital Housing Authority" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $12,000,000 for the "Selective Service System" instead of $10,180,000 as proposed by the House and $12,681,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $1,000,000 for "General operating expenses" of the Veterans' Administration instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $65,000,000 for "Disaster relief" instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment authorizing use of nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for special studies, with an amendment limiting such expenses to $500,000.

CHAPTER V

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 10: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $1,028,000 for "Management and Protection, National Park Service," as proposed by the House instead of $1,245,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $827,000 for "Maintenance and Rehabilitation of Physical Facilities, National Park Service," as proposed by the House instead of $892,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $1,711,000 for "Construction, National Park Service," as proposed by the Senate instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to provide $2,500,000 for "Administration of Territories, Office of Territories."

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $148,000 for "Management and Investigations of Resources, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries." as proposed by the House instead of $193,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $658,000 for "Management and Investigations of Resources, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife," as proposed by the House instead of $712,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Related agencies

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $18,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $18,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, National Capital Planning Commission," as proposed by the House instead of $68,000 as provided by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 19: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 20: Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to the time period during which the funds appropriated will be available.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22: Delete language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $9,500,000 for "National Teacher Corps" as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER VII

Legislative branch

Amendment No. 24: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide $200,000 for "Inquiries and investigations," and $30,000 for payment to the widow of a deceased Senator.

CHAPTER VIII

Public works

Amendment No. 26: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $7,350,000 for "Operation and maintenance, general Corps of Engineers," as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to provide $1,400,000 for "Upper Colorado River storage project, Bureau of Reclamation."

CHAPTER IX

Department of State

Amendment No. 29: Changes chapter number.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which inserts an appropriation of $200,000 for "Fees and expenses of witnesses."

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment which provides an appropriation of $4,600,000 for "1967 Alaska Centennial."

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $160,000 for "Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center" as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 33: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $294,904,000 for "Operations," as proposed by the Senate instead of $269,904,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XI

Claims and judgments

Amendment No. 35: Changes chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37: Appropriate $10,828,683 to pay for certain claims as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,251,798 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II

Increased pay costs

Legislative Branch

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Appropriates $750,850 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendments Nos. 40 through 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendments which provide that the funds are to be derived by transfer.

Department of Defense

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Amendment No. 53: Provides increase of $575,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of increase of $75,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses and of $1,575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the House.

Federal Aviation Agency

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the House.

GEORGE MAHON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
TOM STEED,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

POLISH MILLENNIUM

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the great event the Polish people throughout the world are currently celebrating. This is, of course, the Polish millennium which marks the introduction of Christianity into Poland, as well as the establishment of Poland as a nation.

One thousand years ago, a prince named Miezko the First united several Polish tribes populating the Oder and Vistula River basins of central Europe, and in 966 he introduced Christianity into his court. This move by the leader of the newly born Polish nation gave the new state links with Western Europe and hastened its rise among the great nations of the continent.

The celebration that is going on now—1,000 years after the momentous steps taken by Miezko the First—shows to the world the indomitable spirit of the Polish people—a spirit that has survived 1,000 years of turmoil and persecution in a stubborn and enlightened defense of freedom and human dignity.

Owing to its geographic position, Poland has over the centuries been subjected to harassment and attack. Poland rightly won the title of "the bulwark of Christianity" in these wars, and also sent the flower of its youth to the crusades to uphold the honor of Christianity. Down through the centuries the Poles have fought to remain a free and independent nation, developing its own culture and heritage.

The contributions of the Poles throughout the world is well known. Where would we be today without the great music of Chopin and Paderewski, of the scientific efforts of Copernicus, or of the Nobel Prize winners, Sienkiewicz and Reymont?

And in this country—the United States of America—there is a well-deserved appreciation of the contributions the Polish people have made to develop and improve this country of ours. The first five Poles arrived in America on the English ship *Mary and Margaret* which landed at Jamestown, Va., on October 1, 1608. From these first five men has come a legacy of which we can all be proud.

The success of our fight for independence from Great Britain is due to a great extent to the efforts of General Kosciuszko, who has been called "the father of American artillery," and General Pulaski, who gave his life for his adopted country during the Revolution.

During the Civil War 168 officers and more than 4,000 men of Polish extraction served in the Union Army, and in the Confederate Army there were 17 officers and about 1,000 men of Polish descent. Approximately 900,000 Polish-Americans served in the American army during the Second World War, and our Polish allies fought alongside our men in the decisive battles of Western Europe following the invasion of Normandy.

This week, when we join with our Polish-American friends in celebrating this great event, we can be thankful for the contributions the Polish-Americans have made to this country. They are a proud, strong and independent people, and their hopes, struggles and desires deserve our sympathy and attention.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 81, I was absent, attending to congressional duties in my home district. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on that rollcall.

(Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. MIZE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. NELSEN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CIVIL SERVICE TASK FORCE REPORT: AMEND THE HATCH ACT TO PROTECT THE CAREER EMPLOYEE

(Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. MIZE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House GOP task force on the civil service, I am pleased to announce that the task force has completed its initial review of its area of responsibility and has for introduction today a bill aimed at closing a very serious loophole in the enforcement of the Hatch Act.

Cosponsoring the bill with me are my task force colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman JOEL T. BROYHILL; the gentleman from Kansas, ROBERT DOLE; the gentleman from Iowa, H. R. GROSS; and the gentleman from New York, CARLTON J. KING.

The basic aim of this bill is to shutoff completely the illicit shakedown of Federal employees for political contributions and also to insure that those in the departments and agencies who attempt such shakedown activities will get their just desserts.

As the law is currently written, the wrongdoers in the "excepted" or schedule C and supergrade positions have, practically speaking, immunity from the consequences of the Hatch Act; while on the other hand, those in the rank-and-file classified service who commit the very same violation would be subjected to severe penalties. Why? Because

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 11, 1966
For actions of May 10, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 77

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....11
Agricultural waste.....30
Alaska.....34
Animal research.....32
Appropriations.....1,12
Atomic energy.....9
Budget.....31
Commodity reserves.....7
Conservation.....22
Electrification.....38
Farm labor.....2
Farm prices.....4,33
Farm program.....13
Fees and charges.....36
Food.....7,30
Foreign aid.....28
Foreign trade.....24
Forest Service.....1
Forestry.....25
Great Society.....26
Horses.....6,39
Housing.....34
Inspection.....39
Inter-American Development Bank.....18
Labeling.....8
Latin America.....10
Loan pools.....3,16,23
Loans.....3,16,23,34
Monetary system.....20
Natural resources.....22
Packaging.....8
Participation sales.....3,16,23
Patent system.....17
Personnel.....19
Population.....29
Poverty.....14
Research animals.....32
Retirement.....19
School milk.....5
Supplemental appropriations.....1
Tire safety.....17
Tree farming.....25
Water pollution.....37
Water research.....27
Wheat.....21
Wildlife.....35

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee reported Interior appropriation bill, including Forest Service. Reps. Teague, Calif., and Dole criticized cost of Secretary Freeman's reply to protests against administration of farm program. Rep. Albert commended administration's farm program. Sen. Bass introduced and discussed bill to provide supplemental financing for REA programs.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14012, the second supplemental appropriation bill. The House concurred in the Senate item of $30,000,000 for the emergency credit revolving fund. For other USDA items see Digest 68. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 9693-701, 9722-4

The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 14215, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, which includes items for the Forest Service (S. Rept. 1154) (p. 9641). Sen. Mansfield said it is hoped to debate this bill Thurs., May 12 (p. 9701). Excerpts from the committee report and a table reflecting committee action are attached to this Digest.

2. FARM LABOR. Sen. Dominick objected to termination of the Mexican farm labor program, speaking from the standpoint of the welfare of Mexican laborers, and inserted an article, "Under the Lid in Mexico: Makings of an Explosion." pp. 9657-8

3. PARTICIPATION SALES. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized the participation sales program, claiming it would result in higher interest cost and hide the true Government expenses. p. 9659

4. FARM PRICES. Sen. Proxmire said farm prices are not too high. pp. 9659-60
Sen. Mundt claimed a revolt is resulting from recent administration statements on farm prices. pp. 9670-1
Sen. Yarborough said the rise in food prices is not the fault of the farmers. pp. 9677-8

5. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire objected to limiting the school milk program to the needy and referred to the objections which were made to proposals that the medicare program be limited to the needy. p. 9660

6. HORSES. Sen. Tydings recommended legislation to prohibit interstate shipment of horses that have been abused for the purpose of altering their natural gait. pp. 9651-4

7. COMMODITY RESERVE. Sen. Pearson asked additional cosponsors for S. 3306, a commodity reserve bill. p. 9654

8. TRUTH IN PACKAGING. Sen. Proxmire spoke in favor of the truth-in-packaging bill. p. 9660

9. ATOMIC ENERGY. Passed without amendment H. R. 14732, to provide 1967 authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission. This bill will now be sent to the President. S. 3293, the companion bill, was indefinitely postponed.

10. LATIN AMERICA. Sen. Kennedy, N. Y., continued his speech on Latin American problems. pp. 9705-16

11. ADJOURNED until Thurs., May 12. p. 9719

HOUSE

12. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967. Passed, 296-82, with amendments this bill, H. R. 14921 (pp. 9724-60). This bill includes items for the Office of Emergency Planning, Office of Science and Technology, Presidential disaster relief, Appalachian Regional Commission, Civil Service Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, Department of Housing and Urban Development, etc.

13. FARM PROGRAM. Reps. Teague, Calif., and Dole criticized the cost of telegrams sent by Secretary Freeman to 40 Members of Congress in answer to their protests of "the manner in which he is administering his Department's $4 billion farm subsidy programs" (pp. 9720-1). Rep. Albert commended and inserted a copy of the Secretary's telegram stating that "it makes clear that at no time in the history of the United States has American agriculture done so well." pp. 9721-2

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1401) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 14, 28, 30, 31, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 25 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14012), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Thursday, May 5, 1966, p. 9497, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall insert in the RECORD an explanation of the conference report.

I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not observe in the Chamber the presence of the ranking minority member [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. PASTORE. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It is absolutely acceptable to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator indicate for the RECORD what, if any, changes of major importance took place in the conference?

Mr. PASTORE. The total amount agreed upon is $2,788,143,303, which is $232,667,600 under the budget estimates; $223,270,735 over the House; and $13,082,700 under the Senate version of the bill.

The following is a brief summary of the major actions taken in the conference report.

The House accepted the Senate amendment providing $30 million for the emergency credit revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration; which is for disasters.

The House accepted the Senate amendment of $140 million for the Asian Development Bank. That originated in the Senate.

A total of $65 million was provided for the President's Disaster Relief Fund, instead of the $75 million proposed by the Senate and $45 million allowed by the House.

There is a compromise on that item. There was a reduction of $10 million on the budget estimate.

The bill includes $2,500,000 for storm damage rehabilitation in Samoa; and $294,904,000 for postal operations, as proposed by the Senate, which is $25 million over the House. That, too, originated in the Senate.

Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the amount that was included in the bill for the Asian Development Bank?

Mr. PASTORE. One hundred and forty million dollars.

Mr. KUCHEL. One hundred and forty million dollars?

Mr. PASTORE. One hundred million dollars is on call. It is not a cash payment. Twenty million dollars and twenty million dollars are for direct obligations. As a matter of fact, it is a condition precedent to our participation in the Bank.

Mr. KUCHEL. And it constitutes the fulfillment of our requirement under the agreement?

Mr. PASTORE. It certainly does.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 25.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the budget estimates, the House and Senate allowances, and the amounts agreed to in conference for each item in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER I				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION				
S. 85	Emergency credit revolving fund	$30,000,000		$30,000,000	$30,000,000
	CHAPTER II				
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
383	Federal payment to District of Columbia	2,300,000	$1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
	OPERATING EXPENSES				
383	Public safety	(1,249,200)	(1,249,200)	(1,249,200)	(1,249,200)
	Overtime	(806,000)	(806,000)	(806,000)	(806,000)
	Wage board employees	(16,700)	(16,700)	(16,700)	(16,700)
	Increased pay costs	(426,500)	(426,500)	(426,500)	(426,500)
383	Parks and recreation	(210,600)	(210,600)	(210,600)	(210,600)
	Overtime	(20,400)	(20,400)	(20,400)	(20,400)
	Wage board employees	(82,500)	(82,500)	(82,500)	(82,500)
	Increased pay costs	(107,700)	(107,700)	(107,700)	(107,700)
	Total, Chapter II	2,300,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
	CHAPTER III				
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS				
S. 85	Asian Development Bank	140,000,000		140,000,000	140,000,000
	CHAPTER IV				
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
	NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY				
S. 85	Operation and maintenance of properties	12,000		12,000	12,000
	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM				
380	Salaries and expenses	12,681,000	10,180,000	12,681,000	12,000,000
	Increased workload	(11,594,000)	(9,093,000)	(11,594,000)	(10,913,000)
	Increased pay costs (civilian)	(902,000)	(902,000)	(902,000)	(902,000)
	Increased pay costs (military)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)	(185,000)

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*—Continued

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER IV—Continued				
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued				
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
S. 85	General operating expenses	$3,000,000		$3,000,000	$1,000,000
383	Compensation and pensions	288,000,000	$288,000,000	288,000,000	288,000,000
383	Readjustment benefits	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
383	Disaster relief	75,000,000	45,000,000	75,000,000	65,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
380	Rent supplement program (*contract authority*)	(*50,000,000*)	(*12,000,000*)	(*12,000,000*)	(*12,000,000*)
	Appropriation		100,000	100,000	100,000
	Proviso relating to local official approval		*Language*	*Language*	*Language*
	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD				
S. 85	Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	Language		Language	Language
	Total, Chapter IV	383,693,000	348,280,000	383,793,000	371,112,000
	CHAPTER V				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT				
383	Management of lands and resources	1,495,000	1,495,000	1,495,000	1,495,000
	Fire suppression, etc	(*1,000,000*)	(*1,000,000*)	(*1,000,000*)	(*1,000,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*495,000*)	(*495,000*)	(*495,000*)	(*495,000*)
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS				
383	Resources management	755,000	755,000	755,000	755,000
	Fire suppression, etc	(*186,000*)	(*186,000*)	(*186,000*)	(*186,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*569,000*)	(*569,000*)	(*569,000*)	(*569,000*)
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE				
383	Management and protection	1,307,000	1,028,000	1,307,000	1,028,000)
	Fire suppression	(*245,000*)	(*245,000*)	(*245,000*)	(*245,000*
	Additional staffing for new facilities	(*279,000*)		(*279,000*)	*0*
	Overtime compensation	(*42,000*)	(*42,000*)	(*42,000*)	(*42,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*741,000*)	(*741,000*)	(*741,000*)	(*741,000*)
383	Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	924,000	827,000	924,000	827,000
	Maintenance staff for new facilities	(*97,000*)		97,000	0
	Wage board increases	(*724,000*)	(*724,000*)	(*724,000*)	(*724,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*103,000*)	(*103,000*)	(*103,000*)	(*103,000*)
383	Construction	1,169,000	900,000	1,169,000	1,169,000
S. 85	Construction	542,000		542,000	542,000
383	Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
	OFFICE OF TERRITORIES				
S. 85	Administration of territories	2,500,000		2,500,000	2,500,000
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES				
383	Management and investigations of resources	203,000	148,000	203,000	148,000
	Pesticides research	(*55,000*)		(*55,000*)	0
	Increased pay costs	(*148,000*)	(*148,000*)	(*148,000*)	(*148,000*)
	BUREAU OF SPORTS FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE				
383	Management and investigations of resources	763,000	658,000	763,000	658,000
	Pesticides research	(*105,000*)		(*105,000*)	0
	Wage board increases	(*180,000*)	(*180,000*)	(*180,000*)	(*180,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*478,000*)	(*478,000*)	(*478,000*)	(*478,000*)
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	FOREST SERVICE				
	Forest protection and utilization:				
383	Forest land management	9,635,000	9,635,000	9,635,000	9,635,000
	Fire suppression	(*7,500,000*)	(*7,500,000*)	(*7,500,000*)	(*7,500,000*)
	Increased pay costs	(*2,135,000*)	(*2,135,000*)	(*2,135,000*)	(*2,135,000*)
383	Forest research (*increased pay costs*)	610,000	610,000	610,000	610,000
383	State and private forestry cooperation (*increased pay costs*)	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
	FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW				
S. 85	Salaries and expenses	29,000		29,000	18,000
	NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION				
383	Salaries and expenses	68,000	18,000	68,000	18,000
	Printing costs	(*50,000*)		(*50,000*)	
	Increased pay costs	(*18,000*)	(*18,000*)	(*18,000*)	(*18,000*)
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
383	Transitional grants to Alaska	876,000	876,000	876,000	876,000
	Total, Chapter V	26,421,000	22,495,000	26,255,700	25,824,000

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*—Continued

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER VI				
	LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY				
383	Trade adjustment activities (*by transfer*)	($10,000,000)	($1,000,000)	($1,000,000)	($1,000,000)
383	Salaries and expenses (*by transfers*)	(1,043,000)	(1,028,000)	(1,028,000)	(1,028,000)
	Increased workload	(805,000)	(790,000)	(790,000)	(790,000)
	Increased pay costs	(238,000)	(238,000)	(238,000)	(238,000)
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS				
383	Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(614,000)	(614,000)	(614,000)	(614,000)
	Increased workload	(350,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)
	Increased pay costs	(264,000)	(264,000)	(264,000)	(264,000)
	Total, Department of Labor	(11,657,000)	(2,642,000)	(2,642,000)	(2,642,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
383	Expansion and improvement of vocational education	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
383	Vocational student loan insurance fund	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
383	Elementary and secondary educational activities	184,000,000	184,000,000	184,000,000	184,000,000
383	Higher educational activities (library assistance)	11,000,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000
380	National Teacher Corps	13,200,000	10,000,000	9,500,000	----------
	Proviso limiting Federal funds to 90 percent of any teacher's salary	----------	Language	Language	Language
	Proviso requiring approval by State educational agency	----------	Language	Language	Language
	Payments to school districts	----------	41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000
	VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION				
383	Grants to States	39,000,000	39,000,000	39,000,000	39,000,000
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
383	National Library of Medicine	4,175,000	4,175,000	4,175,000	4,175,000
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION				
383	Payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged	367,800,000	125,800,000	125,800,000	125,800,000
383	Payment for military service credits	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000
	WELFARE ADMINISTRATION				
383	Grants to States for public assistance	381,000,000	381,000,000	381,000,000	381,000,000
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS				
383	Gallaudet College: Salaries and expenses	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000
383	Howard University: Salaries and expenses	216,000	216,000	216,000	216,000
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
383	Office of Field Administration:				
	Salaries and expenses	27,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
	By transfer	(68,000)	(53,000)	(53,000)	(53,000)
	Increased workload	(59,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)
	Increased pay costs	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)
	Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	902,028,000	902,028,000
	RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD				
383	Limitation on salaries and expenses (increase)	(1,075,000)	(1,075,000)	(1,075,000)	(1,075,000)
	Total, Chapter VI	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	902,028,000	902,028,000
	CHAPTER VII				
	LEGISLATIVE				
	SENATE				
	Payment to widow of deceased Senator	----------	----------	----------	30,000
----------	Inquiries and investigations	----------	----------	200,000	200,000
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
----------	Payments to widows of deceased Members	----------	90,000	90,000	90,000
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
	Capitol Buildings and Grounds:				
415	Capitol Grounds	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000
	Total, Chapter VII	17,000	107,000	307,000	337,000
	CHAPTER VIII				
	PUBLIC WORKS				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
	Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil:				
383	Operation and maintenance (general)	7,350,000	7,000,000	7,350,000	7,350,000
	Hurricane damage repairs	(4,230,000)	(4,230,000)	(4,230,000)	(4,230,000)
	Increased pay costs	(3,120,000)	(2,770,000)	(3,120,000)	(3,120,000)
383	Flood control, hurricane, and shore protection emergencies	7,750,000	7,750,000	7,750,000	7,750,000
	THE PANAMA CANAL				
	Canal Zone Government:				
383	Operating expenses	404,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
	Overtime	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)	(145,000)
	Increased pay costs	(259,000)	(155,000)	(155,000)	(155,000)

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*—Continued

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER VIII—Continued				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
S. 88	Upper Colorado River Storage Project (*by transfer*)	($3,600,000)		($1,400,000)	($1,400,000)
	Southwestern Power Administration:				
383	Construction	520,000	$520,000	520,000	520,000
	Total, Chapter VIII	16,024,000	15,570,000	15,920,000	15,920,000
	CHAPTER IX				
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS				
383	Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	500,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
383	Payment to foreign service retirement and disability fund	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS				
383	American sections, international commissions	32,000			
	Total, Department of State	577,000	495,000	495,000	495,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
383	Fees and expenses of witnesses (limitation increase)	Language	Language	Language	Language
S. 88	Fees and expenses of witnesses (*by transfer*)	(200,000)		(200,000)	(200,000)
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM				
383	Support of U.S. prisoners	500,000	475,000	475,000	475,000
	Total, Department of Justice	500,000	475,000	475,000	475,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
S. 85	1967 Alaska Centennial	4,600,000		4,600,000	4,600,000
	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES				
S. 85	Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center	160,000		160,000	160,000
	PATENT OFFICE				
383	Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	Printing	(395,000)	(395,000)	(395,000)	(395,000)
	Increased pay costs	(605,000)	(605,000)	(605,000)	(605,000)
	Total, Department of Commerce	5,760,000	1,000,000	5,760,000	5,760,000
	THE JUDICIARY				
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICE				
383	Salaries of judges	220,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
383	Fees of jurors and commissioners	1,165,000	1,165,000	1,165,000	1,165,900
	Total, the Judiciary	1,385,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS				
383	Salaries and expenses	468,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
	Special study	(442,000)	(399,000)	(399,000)	(399,000)
	Increased pay costs	(26,000)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(26,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (OFFICE OF EDUCATION)				
383	Civil rights educational activities	3,250,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION				
383	Salaries and expenses	742,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	Increased workload	(690,000)	(448,000)	(448,000)	(448,000)
	Increased pay costs	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)
	Total, Chapter IX	12,682,000	7,260,000	12,020,000	12,020,000
	CHAPTER X				
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
	(Out of the postal fund)				
383	Operations	296,904,000	269,904,000	294,904,000	294,904,000
and	*Increased mail volume*	(82,000,000)	(57,000,000)	(82,000,000)	(82,000,000)
S. 88	*5-day workweek for postmasters*	(9,500,000)	(9,500,900)	(9,500,000)	(9,500,000)
	Improve parcel post	(2,000,000)			
	Terminal leave payments	(6,193,000)	(6,193,000)	(6,193,000)	(6,193,000)
	Increased pay costs	(197,211,000)	(197,211,000)	(197,211,000)	(197,211,000)
383	Transportation	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
383	Plant and equipment	3,106,000	3,106,000	3,106,000	3,106,000
	Total, Chapter X	321,010,000	294,010,000	319,010,000	319,010,000

TABLE I.—*The 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1966 (H.R. 14012)*—Continued

Document No.		Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
	CHAPTER XI				
414	Claims and judgments	$10,251,798	$10,251,798	$10,251,798	
S. 87	Claims and judgments	576,885		576,885	$10,828,683
	Total, Chapter XI	10,828,683	10,251,798	10,828,683	10,828,683
	Title I, total	[1] 2,049,417,683	[2] 1,601,751,798	[3] 1,841,412,383	1,828,329,683
405	TITLE II.—Increased pay costs (*see* Table II)	[4] 971,393,220	963,120,770	[5] 959,813,620	[5] 959,813,620
	Grand total	3,020,810,903	2,564,872,568	2,801,226,003	2,788,143,303

[1] Includes $208,768,500 for increased pay costs.
[2] Includes $208,314,500 for increased pay costs.
[3] Includes $208,664,500 for increased pay costs.
[4] Includes $838,850 for Senate items.
[5] Includes $750,850 for Senate items.

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
SENATE				
Compensation of the Vice President and Senators	$8,065		$8,065	$8,065
Salaries, officers and employees	643,105		543,105	543,105
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate	7,425		7,425	7,425
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Senate policy committees	9,940		9,940	9,940
Automobiles and maintenance	840		840	840
Inquiries and investigations	116,865		116,865	116,865
Folding documents	945		945	945
Miscellaneous items	20,065		32,065	32,065
Total, Senate items	807,250		719,250	719,250
Joint items:				
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures	945	$945	945	945
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Joint Economic Committee	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	8,250	8,250	8,250	8,250
Joint Committee on Printing	3,750	3,750	3,750	3,750
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	10,530	10,530	10,530	10,530
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy	655	655	655	655
Joint Committee on Defense Production	2,160	2,160	2,160	2,160
Total, joint items	35,290	35,290	35,290	35,290
HOUSE				
Compensation of Members	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500
Office of the Speaker	3,155	3,155	3,155	3,155
Office of the Parliamentarian	2,755	2,755	2,755	2,755
Compilation of Precedents	270	270	270	270
Office of the Chaplain	410	410	410	410
Office of the Clerk	41,230	41,230	41,230	41,230
Committee employees	103,000	103,000	103,000	103,000
Sergeant at Arms	28,205	28,205	28,205	28,205
Doorkeeper	43,745	43,745	43,745	43,745
Postmaster	13,825	13,825	13,825	13,825
6 minority employees	3,175	3,175	3,175	3,175
Majority floor leader	2,340	2,340	2,940	2,940
Minority floor leader	1,940	1,940	1,940	1,940
Majority whip	1,565	1,565	1,565	1,565
Minority whip	1,565	1,565	1,565	1,565
Printing clerks	430	430	430	430
Technical assistant to attending physician	385	385	385	385
Official Reporters of Debates	6,880	6,880	6,880	6,880
Official reporters to committees	6,940	6,940	6,940	6,940
Legislative counsel	7,970	7,970	7,970	7,907
Members' clerk hire	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000
Special and select committees	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Coordinator of information	3,675	3,675	3,675	3,675
Revision of the laws	730	730	730	730
Speaker's auto	330	330	330	330
Majority leader's auto	330	330	330	330
Minority leader's auto	330	330	330	330
Miscellaneous items		19,000	19,000	19,000
Total, House items	1,152,680	1,171,680	1,171,680	1,171,680
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
Office of Architect of the Capitol: Salaries	13,900	13,900	13,900	13,900
Capitol Buildings and Grounds:				
Capitol buildings	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Capitol grounds	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Senate office buildings	31,000		31,000	31,000
Senate garage	600		600	600
Capitol Power Plant	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Library buildings and grounds, structural aud mechanical care	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Total, Architect	118,500	86,900	118,500	118,500
BOTANIC GARDEN				
Salaries and expenses	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS				
Salaries and expenses	283,000	256,700	256,700	256,700
Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses	51,500	51,500	51,500	51,500
Legislative Reference Service: Salaries and expenses	67,000	62,200	62,200	62,200
Distribution of catalog cards: Salaries and expenses	65,300	65,300	65,300	65,300
Books for the blind: Salaries and expenses	7,300	6,600	6,600	6,600
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600
Total, Library of Congress	477,700	445,900	445,900	445,900

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*—Continued

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued				
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE				
Office of the Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses	$70,800	Language	Language	Language
Total, legislative	2,668,220	$1,745,770	$2,496,620	$2,496,620
THE JUDICIARY				
Supreme Court of the United States: Salaries	41,000	41,000	41,000	41,000
Care of buildings and grounds	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
Court of Claims: Salaries and expenses	13,300	13,300	13,300	13,300
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:				
Salaries of supporting personnel	818,000	818,000	818,000	818,000
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Expenses of referees (special account)	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Total, the Judiciary	1,057,300	1,057,300	1,057,300	1,057,300
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
The White House Office: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(*85,000*)	(*85,000*)	(*85,000*)	(*85,000*)
Bureau of the Budget: Salaries and expenses	131,000	131,000	131,000	131,000
Council of Economic Advisers: Salaries and expenses	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
National Security Council: Salaries and expenses	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Office of Emergency Planning: Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies (*by transfer*)	(*6,000*)	(*6,000*)	(*6,000*)	(*6,000*)
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: Salaries and expenses	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	162,000	162,000	162,000	162,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
Economic assistance:				
Administrative expenses, Agency for International Development (*by transfer*)	(*980,000*)	(*980,000*)	(*980,000*)	(*980,000*)
Administrative and other expenses, Department of State (*by transfer*)	(*42,000*)	(*42,000*)	(*42,000*)	(*42,000*)
Total, funds appropriated to the President	(*1,022,000*)	(*1,022,000*)	(*1,022,000*)	(*1,022,000*)
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
Agricultural Research Service:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Research	2,402,500	2,402,500	2,402,500	2,402,500
Plant and animal disease and pest control	1,268,500	1,268,500	1,268,500	1,268,500
Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
Extension Service: Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses (*by transfer*)	(*64,000*)	(*64,000*)	(*64,000*)	(*64,000*)
Farmer Cooperative Service: Salaries and expenses	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
Soil Conservation Service:				
Conservation operations	2,608,000	2,608,000	2,608,000	2,608,000
Watershed planning	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
Watershed protection	585,000	585,000	585,000	585,000
Flood prevention	1600,00	160,000	160,000	160,000
Great Plains conservation program	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000
Resource conservation and development	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,000
Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	246,000	246,000	246,000	246,000
Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Consumer and Marketing Service: Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs	1,905,000	1,905,000	1,905,000	1,905,000
Foreign Agricultural Service: Salaries and expenses	178,000	178,000	178.000	178,000
Commodity Exchange Authority: Salaries and expenses	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000
Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses	268,000	268,000	268,000	268,000
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses	202,000	202,000	202,000	202,000
Rural Community Development Service: Salaries and expenses	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Office of the Inspector General: Salaries and expenses	145,000	145,000	145,000	145,000
Office of the General Counsel: Salaries and expenses	102,000	102,000	102,000	102,000
Office of Information: Salaries and expenses	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
National Agricultural Library: Salaries and expenses	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000
Office of Management Services: Salaries and expenses	59,000	59,000	59,000	59,000
General administration: Salaries and expenses	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Forest Service: Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	964,000	964,000	964,000	964,000
Total, Agriculture	13,051,000	13,051,000	13,051,000	13,051,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
General administration: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	89,000	89,000	(*89,000*)	(*89,000*)
Office of Business Economics: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	50,000	50,000	(*50,000*)	(*50,000*)
Bureau of the Census:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	320,000	320,000	(*320,000*)	(*320,000*)
1964 Census of Agriculture (*by transfer*)	110,000	110,000	(*110,000*)	(*110,000*)
Business and Defense Services Administration: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	125,000	125,000	(*125,000*)	(*125,000*)
International activities:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	160,000	160,000	(*160,000*)	(*160,000*)
Export control (*by transfer*)	100,000	100,000	(*100,000*)	(*100(000*)
Transfer to Customs	(*33,400*)	(*33,400*)	(*33,400*)	(*33,400*)
Office of Field Services: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	90,000	90,000	(*90,000*)	(*90,000*)
Coast and Geodetic Survey: Salaries and expenses	510,000	510,000	510,000	510,000
National Bureau of Standards: Research and technical services (*by transfer*)	500,000	500,000	(*500,000*)	(*500,000*)
Weather Bureau:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	1,200,000	1,200,000	(*754,000*)	(*754,000*)
Salaries and expenses			446,000	446,000
Research and development	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Meteorological satellite operations	48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000
Maritime Administration:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	222,000	222,000	(*222,000*)	(*222,000*)
Administrative expenses (limitation)	(*200,000*)	(*200,000*)	(*200,000*)	(*200,000*)
Reserve fleet expenses (limitation)	(*22,000*)	(*22,000*)	(*22,000*)	(*22,000*)
Maritime training (*by transfer*)	38,000	38,000	(*38,000*)	(*38,000*)
Bureau of Public Roads: Limitation on general administrative expenses (increase)	(*950,000*)	(*950,000*)	(*950,000*)	(*950,000*)
Total, Commerce	3,662,000	3,662,000	1,104,000	1,104,000

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*—Continued

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY				
Military personnel:				
Military personnel, Army	$222,100,000	$222,100,000	$222,100,000	$222,100,000
Military personnel, Navy	182,600,000	182,600,000	182,600,000	182,600,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	42,400,000	42,400,000	42,400,000	42,400,000
Military personnel, Air Force	227,600,000	227,600,000	227,600,000	227,600,000
Reserve personnel, Navy	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Reserve personnel, Air Force	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
National Guard personnel, Army	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
National Guard personnel, Air Force	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Retired pay, Defense	71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000
Operation and maintenance:				
Operation and maintenance, Army	33,400,000	33,400,000	33,400,000	33,400,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	1,054,000	1,054,000	1,054,000	1,054,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	27,600,000	27,600,000	27,600,000	27,600,000
Operation and maintenance, defense agencies	14,356,000	14,356,000	14,356,000	14,356,000
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Court of Military Appeals, Defense	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
Total, Defense—Military	863,521,000	863,521,000	863,521,000	863,521,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
Department of the Army:				
Cemeterial expenses: Salaries and expenses	67,000	67,000	67,000	67,000
Corps of Engineers—Civil: General expenses	385,000	385,000	385,000	385,000
Ryukyu Islands: Administration	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
The Panama Canal: Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general and administrative expenses (increase)	(137,000)	(137,000)	(137,000)	(137,000)
U.S. Soldiers' Home: Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay (increase)	(146,000)	(146,000)	(146,000)	(146,000)
Total, Defense—Civil	492,000	492,000	492,000	492,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
Hospital and medical care	770,000	770,000	770,000	770,000
Foreign quarantine activites	212,000	212,000	212,000	212,000
Indian health activities	1,355,000	1,355,000	1,355,000	1,355,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital: Salaries and expenses (indefinite)	685,000	685,000	685,000	685,000
Social Security Administration: Limitation on salaries and expenses	(8,037,000)	(8,037,000)	(8,037,000)	(8,037,000)
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(18,000)	(18,000)	(18,000)	(18,000)
Surplus property utilization	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare	3,042,000	3,042,000	3,042,000	3,042,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
Federal Housing Administration:				
Administrative expenses (limitation)	(75,000)	(75,000)		
Nonadministrative expenses (limitation)	(1,575,000)	(1,575,000)	(575,000)	(575,000)
Public Housing Administration: Administrative expenses	405,000	405,000	405,000	405,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Bureau of Indian Affairs:				
Education and welfare services	1,202,400	1,202,400	1,202,400	1,202,400
General administrative expenses	103,000	103,000	103,000	103,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: Salaries and expenses	68,000	68,000	68,000	68,000
Office of Territories: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	102,600	102,600	102,600	102,600
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,510,000
Bureau of Mines:				
Conservation and development of mineral resources	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Health and safety	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000
General administrative expenses	22,000	22,000	22,000	22,000
Office of Oil and Gas: Salaries and expenses	16,300	16,300	16,300	16,300
Fish and Wildlife Service:				
Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: Salaries and expenses	8,500	8,500	8,500	8,500
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:				
Management and investigations of resources (*by transfer*)	(86,800)	(86,800)	(86,800)	(86,800)
General administrative expenses	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands (appropriation of receipts)	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: General administrative expenses	34,300	34,300	34,300	34,300
National Park Service: General administrative expenses	57,000	57,000	57,000	57,000
Bureau of Reclamation: General administrative expenses (*by transfer*)	(241,200)	(241,200)	(241,200)	(241,200)
Bonneville Power Administration: Operations and maintenance	173,000	173,000	173,000	173,000
Southwestern Power Administration: Operations and maintenance	25,300	25,300	25,300	25,300
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses	109,800	109,800	109,800	109,800
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
Office of Water Resources Research: Salaries and expenses	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Total, Interior	4,160,200	4,160,200	4,160,200	4,160,200
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
Legal activities and general administration:				
Salaries and expenses, general administration	75,000			
Alien property activities limitation	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	165,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	647,000	647,000	647,000	647,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses	3,735,000	3,735,000	3,735,000	3,735,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	1,782,000	1,782,000	1,782,000	1,782,000
Federal prison system: Salaries and expenses	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000
Total, Justice	7,489,000	7,244,000	7,244,000	7,244,000
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
Manpower Administration: Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (*by transfer*)	(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)
Office of Manpower Administration:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(66,000)	(66,000)	(66,000)	(66,000)
Manpower development and training activities (*by transfer*)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)
Wage and labor standards:				
Bureau of Labor Standards (*by transfer*)	(39,000)	(39,000)	(39,000)	(39,000)
Women's Bureau (*by transfer*)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)
Bureau of Employees' Compensation: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(59,550)	(59,550)	(59,550)	(59,550)

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*—Continued

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued				
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	($242,000)	($242,000)	($242,000)	($242,000)
Bureau of International Labor Affairs: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(71,000)	(71,000)	(71,000)	(71,000)
Office of the Secretary:				
Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)
Federal contract compliance program (*by transfer*)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)
Total, Labor	(657,550)	(657,550)	(657,550)	(657,550)
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
Administration and regional operation	2,059,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
Administration of foreign affairs:				
Salaries and expenses (appropriation)	1,337,400	1,337,400	1,337,400	1,337,400
By transfer	(1,422,600)	(1,422,600)	(1,422,600)	(1,422,600)
International organizations and conferences: Missions to international organizations (*by transfer*)	(59,000)	(59,000)	(59,000)	(59,000)
International commissions:				
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	(17,000)	(17,000)	(17,000)	(17,000)
Total, Department of State	1,337,400	1,337,400	1,337,400	1,337,400
TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	138,000	138,000	138,000	138,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	2,043,000	2,043,000	2,043,000	2,043,000
Bureau of Narcotics:				
Salaries and expenses	80,000			
By transfer		(80,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)
Bureau of the Public Debt: Administering the public debt	360,000	360,000	360,000	360,000
Coast Guard:				
Operating expenses	9,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
By transfer		(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Retired pay	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Reserve training	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
Internal Revenue Service:				
Salaries and expenses	381,000	381,000	381,000	381,000
Revenue accounting and processing	3,472,000	3,472,000	3,472,000	3,472,000
Compliance	10,305,000	9,305,000	9,305,000	9,305,000
Office of the Treasurer:				
Salaries and expenses	60,000			
By transfer		(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)
U.S. Secret Service: Salaries and expenses, guard force (*by transfer*)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)	(11,000)
Total, Treasury	28,289,000	22,149,000	22,149,000	22,149,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
Federal Aviation Agency:				
Operations	9,500,000	9,500,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	54,000	54,000	54,000	54,000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport	62,000	62,000	62,000	62,000
General Services Administration:				
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service:				
Appropriation	806,000	806,000	806,000	806,000
By transfer	(55,000)	(55,000)	(55,000)	(55,000)
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	336,000	336,000	336,000	336,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service (*by transfer*)	(135,000)	(135,000)	(135,000)	(135,000)
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator (*by transfer*)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(33,000)
Veterans' Administration:				
General operating expenses	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Medical and prosthetic research	365,000	365,000	365,000	365,000
Medical care	17,456,000	17,456,000	17,456,000	17,456,000
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses:				
Appropriation	528,000	528,000	528,000	528,000
By transfer	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)
Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses (increase)	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: Salaries and expenses	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses	346,000	346,000	346,000	346,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:				
Limitation and administrative expenses (inercase)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)
Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (increase)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)
Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses	68,000	68,000	68,000	68,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Federal Trade Commission: Salaries and expenses	312,500	312,500	312,500	312,500
General Accounting Office: Salaries and expenses	535,000	535,000	535,000	535,000
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Salaries and expenses	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000
National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses	548,100	548,100	548,100	548,100
National Mediation Board: Salaries and expenses	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
Renegotiation Board: Salaries and expenses	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Small Business Administration: Salaries and expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Smithsonian Institution:				
Salaries and expenses	453,000	453,000	453,000	453,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	66,000	66,000	66,000	66,000
Tariff Commission: Salaries and expenses	46,000	46,000	46,000	46,000
Tax Court of the United States: Salaries and expenses	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
U.S. Information Agency: Salaries and expenses	1,461,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000
Total, independent agencies	40,048,100	39,592,100	38,092,100	38,092,100

TABLE II.—*Title II—Increased pay costs (H. Doc. 405)*—Continued

	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Conference action
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
(Out of District of Columbia Funds)				
Operating expenses:				
General operating expenses	($325,800)	($325,800)	($325,800)	($325,800)
Health and welfare	(920,500)	(920,500)	(920,500)	(920,500)
Highways and traffic	(95,900)	(95,900)	(95,900)	(95,900)
Sanitary engineering	(253,000)	(253,000)	(253,000)	(253,000)
Total, District of Columbia	(1,595,200)	(1,595,200)	(1,595,200)	(1,595,200)
Total, title II	971,393,220	963,120,770	959,813,620	959,813,620

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I inquire of the majority leader what his plans are for the rest of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no further business will be transacted today. However, I understand that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] will resume his very important speech, begun yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been completed, the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is hoped that on Thursday the Senate will take up the Department of the Interior appropriations bill.

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE SUBJECT OF BIRTH CONTROL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the request of Mrs. David R. Mogilka, coordinator of the South Side Mothers Reverence for Life Group of Milwaukee; Mrs. Alvin Emmons, and Mrs. Ray Kuffel, coordinator and assistant coordinator, respectively, of the Civic Awareness Group of Greater Milwaukee, I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF MRS. DAVID R. MOGILKA, COORDINATOR OF THE SOUTH SIDE MOTHERS REVERENCE FOR LIFE GROUP OF MILWAUKEE; MRS. ALVIN EMMONS AND MRS. RAY KUFFEL, COORDINATOR AND ASSISTANT COORDINATOR, RESPECTIVELY, OF THE CIVIC AWARENESS GROUP OF GREATER MILWAUKEE

For the past 19 months, we have been actively engaged in opposing Government involvement in the matter of birth control. This effort was initiated when the Planned Parenthood Association of Milwaukee, applied for Federal funds under the anti-poverty act. Because of the actions of an aroused citizenry and the opposition of duly elected public bodies, this application has not been approved.

It was not sufficient, however, to oppose Government involvement on the local scene alone since it became apparent that programs involving almost every phase of birth control were being implemented nationally—quietly and swiftly and behind the scenes—despite known and demonstrated opposition and with an apparent lack of legal authority for the disbursement of public moneys for said programs. Note the following examples:

1. Economic opportunity act—over 18 projects funded:

(a) Nowhere in the provisions of the EOA of 1964, Public Law 88-452 is there a mention of, discussion of or referral to birth control projects in any form as possible programs for implementation.

(b) "There's no possibility the bill would allow any such thing (birth control)" promised the EOA floor manager in the House last year. (Newsweek, Sept. 13, 1965.)

(c) An amendment by Senator JOSEPH CLARK approved only by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee was to grant official sanction to birth control projects already approved by the OEO. This amendment was never brought to the floor of the House.

(d) Authority for birth control grants under EOA is supposed to be found in a 1965 amendment which added the words "but not limited to" after the word "including" in reference to types of projects under section 205(a) of the EOA. (Communication from Richard S. Granat, Office of General Counsel, OEO, Oct. 21, 1965.)

2. U.S. Department of the Interior: Birth control information and devices available to the Indians and Eskimos by directive of the Secretary of said Department.

(a) Program justified by Secretary Stewart L. Udall on the basis that it is in line with a May 5, 1965, report of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences. (News release and directive of Secretary of the Interior, June 2, 1965.)

(b) Program justified by Secretary Udall on the basis that it is in line with President Johnson's state of the Union message relating to the population problem. (Communication from Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Aug. 12, 1965.)

3. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Programs are being implemented and Federal money is being disbursed under broad interpretation of authority under existing laws. Note: Use of Federal money for contraceptives to 15-year-old unmarrieds in Chicago.

(a) On January 24, 1966, HEW Secretary John W. Gardner quietly issued a directive that put the United States in the business of offering contraceptives and birth control instruction not just to families but to all American women, wed or not. (Newsweek, Apr. 11, 1966.)

(b) Mrs. Catherine Oettinger, head of the Federal Children's Bureau, told an audience in Boston a few weeks ago that her department had a "clear mandate" from the President to support birth control programs.

4. United Nations: Eighteen-nation population commission has swung into action without majority approval and despite the fact that in 1962 a similar proposal was defeated in the U.N. Assembly.

5. Agency for International Development (AID): Considerable groundwork has been established for an extension of family planning activities in the United States and abroad on the basis of a directive of AID Director David Bell.

(a) This groundwork was laid looking toward subsequent congressional approval of family planning under foreign aid. (Memo by AID to White House Conference, Nov. 29, 1965).

(b) Dr. Edgar Burman, birth control specialist in the Latin American Bureau, cited provision enacted in 1963 which allows "research into problems of population growth" as the authority for AID action, but admitted that AID activities go beyond commonly accepted definition of research and argued that AID's counsel believed that the provision allowed a loose interpretation.

(c) Dr. Burman contended that a public announcement of AID's increased emphasis on family planning had been made last March by AID Director Bell. AID officials admitted that no public statement had been made. Director David Bell simply had issued a field directive to AID personnel. (John H. Sullivan in the National Catholic Reporter, December 15, 1965).

(d) Congressman ZABLOCKI has challenged the AID's authority so much so that Senator FULBRIGHT has deemed it necessary to introduce an amendment which "specifically authorizes the use of economic assistance funds, on request, to furnish technical and other assistance for the control of population growth". (Apparently this authority does not now exist.)

Together with the implementation of programs it became clear, as Russell Shaw reported in February 1966, that a vigorous publicity and propaganda campaign was mounted to create an atmosphere of approval and consensus for Government birth control with the series of Senate hearings conducted by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, on proposals to create population offices headed by assistant secretaries in HEW and the State Department, being a major factor in this drive. Testimony, in the form of a letter dated August 31, 1965, was presented by the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Member of Congress, Fourth Congressional District, Milwaukee, to the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, chairman of Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, on behalf of Mrs. David R. Mogilka, for inclusion in the hearings relating to bill, S. 1676, 89th Congress, 1965. The testimony reads as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
August 31, 1965.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE GRUENING: Pursuant to the suggestion in your letter of August 19, 1965, to the Honorable CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, I am submitting the following statement to your honorable body and I am respectfully requesting that it be entered and made a part of the record as though it were in fact read by me at your hearings relating to bill S. 1676.

In the first instance, I would like to register my vigorous and unalterable opposition to bill S. 1676 which provides for certain reorganiaztions in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes. I am not only speaking as a mother, citizen, and taxpayer, but I am also voicing the sentiments of the almost 6,000 persons whose signatures were submitted in opposition to a local project for Federal funds for birth control clinics under the antipoverty act. Two thousand of these signatures came from the south side mothers in the 4th congressional district in Milwaukee and 4,000 were submitted by the civic awareness group of Greater Milwaukee. In passing, I might indicate that the common council of Milwaukee passed a resolution in opposition to the use of Federal funds for a birth control clinic and the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors also voiced its opposition.

The involvement of the Federal Government in this area of extreme privacy and intimacy clearly oversteps the reasonable boundaries of governmental authority. Interference with the fundamentally natural autonomy of the family as a social unit leads only to the destruction of the family as a basic unit of society with the accompanying disaster not only to our governmental structure but also to the individuals involved.

Further, specific provisions of bill S. 1676 relating to population data and its compilation constitute a duplication of governmental activity. Such statistics are now readily avaiable from the population census as taken by the United States and at least 150 countries or areas. As you know, a census reveals not only the basic demographic trends such as population growth, internal redistribution, urbanization, and alterations in the age and sex structures, but also provides knowledge of changes in the nation's occupational and industrial composition, in its level of living, education and employment and in its regional and group differentiation. It is used further in the computation of birth and death rates, in the making of life tables and in the analysis of economic development cycles. Future trends can be estimated and military and economic manpower potentials, consumer needs, school requirements, growth in metropolitan areas, potential costs of social security measures and requirements for highways, utilities, parks, water, and health services can be projected.

I am sure you are aware, that at least 150 countries or areas have collected individual data on more than 2 billion persons, and that the U.N. not only encourages countries to take censuses, but also sponsors regional statistical committees. In the reporting a census by China in 1953, the last large part of the world was removed from demographic darkness. It is generally agreed that the population of the entire world is known with a great degree of accuracy and that the structure and patterns of change of populations, including socio-economic characteristics, are widely understood. In 1963, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare increased its commitments for research on human reproduction from less than $3 million to more than $6 million annually.

In the face of the ready availability of this monumental statistical information—and I refer your honorable body to the September 6, 1965 issue of the U.S. News & World Report for ample samples—it becomes abundantly clear that there is no need for further additional agencies to gather more statistics. Any expenditure in this regard becomes only a waste of taxpayers' money.

The other provisions of this bill, S. 1676, which deal with the use of Federal money for the dissemination of birth control information and materials are totally unacceptable because of the conflict with the moral code of a large segment of the population. The use of artificial methods of birth control is contrary to the moral principles of and is personally offensive to a substantial group. There is no question that government must be concerned with, responsible for and ever watchful about the morals of its citizens. Will the laws now reach down to the lowest common denominator of human behavior?

The "birth controller" advocates action contrary to the principles of conduct which have been implanted in the nature of man by God and expressed in what we call the natural law. As Dr. John Marshall states in his "Medicine and Morals," this natural law "is not an arbitrary code which applies to one particular religious denomination or to one era of human history. It is an integral part of creation, being, as it were, built into its structure." The evil of destroying the life of an unborn child then is not just a matter of some ecclesiastical decision; it is basically and fundamentally wrong.

It would follow then, that if the natural law is the plan by which man is intended to live and act in order to secure proper development and fulfillment of his nature, continual flouting of that plan cannot but be detrimental to man as a whole. So much so, that if more and more men continue to live in conflict with this natural law, it becomes only a matter of time before our way of life is destroyed. Each chip in the armor of our morals of society contributes to the eventual downfall and destruction of that society. This downfall then becomes inevitable because ethics are not simple rules of conduct which change from one generation to the next but are unchanging principles upon which any healthy society must be based.

But how mundane the cries of the birth controllers have become. Not enough space. Not enough food. Too many people. There is not a periodicial or a newspaper that at one time or another has not taken up the hue and the cry. The latest innovation are car stickers. I personally observed a California licensed car in Salt Lake City sporting a sign which read: "Trouble parking? Support Planned Parenthood." And what are they really saying? "We want this land for ourselves. We want this wealth for ourselves. We want all the world has to offer for ourselves. We do not want 'hordes' of people. We do not want our standard of living threatened by having to give to the less fortunate. We want to gather all the wordly goods to our bosoms and hang on to them—they are ours." This "birth controller" who was given the precious gift of life in trust now refuses to pass it on and is violating that trust.

And how does he propose to do this? With whatever means of birth control become the most feasible or perhaps the most lucrative. Let us consider the so-called pill. The Johns Hopkins University Clinic has withdrawn the pill from use because they do not want to be medically responsible for the occasional serious complications associated with this method. Serious disorders including completc or partial blindness of varying duration, swelling of the optic nerve, sudden bulging of the eyeballs, dizziness, severe headaches, blurred or double vision and unexplained bleeding are being reported by doctors. A release from London states that Baroness E. Summerskill, life peeress, said in the House of Lords that permission for further sale of the pills should be withdrawn because of possible side effects such as thrombosis. Further, a release from Stoke-on-Trent, England, states: "The Dunlop Committee, thc British Government's 'watchdog' on drugs, has received a report indicating that contraceptive pills may have been responsible for a blood clotting that resulted in the death of a woman 6 months after she had started taking the pills. The inquest was on Mrs. Jean Rowley, who died from blood clotting. The pathologist who presided at the inquest declared that it was impossible to deny the possibility that taking the pills had contributed to the development of the condition that caused her death."

Despite all this evidence, a February 3, 1965, Wall Street Journal article stated that "the expansion of public birth control programs has provided a major new market for drug companies selling contraceptives. It's estimated that the industry this year will sell $4 million worth of oral contraceptives to Government birth control programs." This represents only a part of the total market for the oral contraceptive and does not even consider the sales of mechanical devices, etc. I pose this question to your honorable body, "Who are the real beneficiaries?"

In May of this year, one of the officers of the Planned Parenthood Association stated that "it is wrong to make as much income on selling of contraceptives as we do" and in the next breath advocated the use of contraceptives for the unmarried on the theory that "it is easier to teach contraception than chastity." Dr. Guttmacher, president of this federation feels that parents themselves are becoming more sophisticated. He was reported as saying, "They know for example, that their son or daughter must go to college equipped with contraceptives." Are you, honorable members of this committee, such sophisticated parents?

Pronouncements of policy action by officers of the Planned Parenthood Federation are becoming increasingly alarming. Consider for a moment, if you will, the following: Dr. Edward T. Tyler, president of the American Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians said that their Los Angeles clinic gives oral contraceptives to the unmarried teenage girls if they bring a note from their mother. Dr. Gordon W. Perkins, associate medical director of Planned Parenthood World-Population, said that girls as young as 13 are given birth control pills in New York, Los Angeles and other cities and that high school and college girls are taking oral contraceptives to prevent an interruption of their studies with an unwanted pregnancy. "After all", he said, "this is just a reflection of the new campus morality". Further, it is a matter of record that voluntary sterilization and efforts to legalize abortion are part of the over all plan of this federation.

Consider further, if you will, parts of the American baby code as expounded by Margaret Sanger, founder of the Planned Parenthood Association. "A marriage shall in itself give husband and wife only the right to a common household and not the right to parenthood. No woman shall have the legal right to bear a child and no man shall have the right to become a father without a permit for parenthood". As recently as February of this year, this founder was quoted as saying that Americans would be much more acceptable when they go abroad to work on the problem if we could get our Government to approve it—perhaps under such terms as population control. Is bill S. 1676 spelling out this philosophy?

Bear with me while I refer you again to the September 6 issue of the U.S. News & World Report. Note if you will the breakdown of the family unit is regarded as the prime cause of the problems presented by the studies undertaken by the Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Complete statistical information is available making further study only redundant. I submit that the program of birth control as proposed by the provisions of this bill will only serve to break down further all semblance of any kind of stability. Are you, honorable members of this com-

delivered through the mails or by one of the 8,000 Department of Agriculture employees in Washington. I cannot say that I am any more impressed by the 732-word telegram than I would have been by a letter. I readily concede that we in Congress should also have used the mails, rather than Western Union, and that is what I assumed we were doing when I joined the protestants.

FARMERS WANT PARITY—NOT COSTLY ADMINISTRATION PUBLICITY

(Mr. DOLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, in Secretary Freeman's 7-page, 730-word telegram, costing an estimated $2,400, sent to me and 39 colleagues yesterday, he said that the 40 signatories to our recent request urging the administration to give fair treatment to farmers, had on 5 key votes voted against the farmer 87 percent of the time.

I have no idea what votes the Secretary selected for his survey, but strongly disagree with his rating system.

Was a vote to restore the 80-percent cut in the school milk program as recommended by Secretary Freeman a vote against the dairy farmer?

Was a vote to restore budget cuts in the school lunch, land-grant college, Farmers Home Administration, REA, and conservation programs as recommended by Secretary Freeman a vote against farmers?

Was the recent vote in the House Agriculture Committee to adopt my resolution requesting reconsideration of the Department of Commerce action imposing export restrictions on cattle hides a vote against cattle ranchers?

Was a vote against mandatory strict controls on feed grain farmers a vote against the farmers? A substantial portion of the Secretary's own political party rejected his recommendations on this subject.

Was a vote against the mandatory strict control wheat certificate plan turned down by over one-half of 1.2 million wheat farmers voting in the 1963 referendum a vote against farmers?

Was a vote for the extension and amendment of Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, a vote against farmers?

Was a vote to deny concessional sales under Public Law 480 to nations which are actively assisting our enemies in North Vietnam a vote against farmers?

Was the introduction and support of both House and Senate resolutions to implement fair treatment for farmers and ranchers in the marketplace a vote against farmers? Apparently the majority leader of the Senate did not think so.

And so it goes—Secretary Freeman, by handpicking five votes which suit his political fancy, has presented a totally inaccurate record of my position and my colleagues' position on agricultural legislation.

The American farmer has every right to ask if there is a place for him in the administration's Great Society. The farmer alone cannot bear the full burden of inflation and it is encouraging to note that administration leaders are finally recognizing this fact.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S REPLY TO THE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include the complete text of the telegram referred to.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the concern of my good friends on the Republican side over the telegram which the Secretary of Agriculture sent to them because it makes clear that at no time in the history of the United States has American agriculture done so well. At no time has farm income been so high in relation to the entire economy. At no time have surpluses been cut back so decisively.

Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 40 of our distinguished colleagues from the other side of the aisle sent a telegram to President Johnson complaining about certain agricultural actions which they said "undermine the very thing we seek." Mr. Speaker, they were not very explicit in their telegram about what they seek, and, after examining their voting records on important farm legislation in the last 5 years, I am at a complete loss to say what they seek. A majority of them did not cast a single "yes" vote in all that period for the five major farm bills which have resulted in the greatest gains in history for the American farmer.

Yesterday Secretary Freeman replied to their telegram. He, too, expressed doubt about the objectives of those Members of Congress who have voted only 13 percent in support of major farm legislation in 5 years. The 40 Members who signed the telegram to the President had an opportunity to cast nearly 200 votes in total in support of these 5 important bills, yet with all these chances to help the farmers they voted for the farmer only 27 times in all.

In his reply to our colleagues, the Secretary of Agriculture recounts the inspiring story of U.S. agriculture. What a change from the sad and dreary state of agriculture in the late fifties. For example, the income gap between farmers and nonfarmers has narrowed by nearly 20 percent since 1960. As the Secretary points out in his telegram, it is the continuing objective of the administration to keep agriculture on the rise. President Johnson and Secretary Freeman are doing their utmost to improve farm income and the farmer's way of life and they are succeeding in this great and noble effort.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
May 9, 1966.

Your recent wire to the President offers an opportunity to look once again at the remarkably successful record of U.S. agriculture. I welcome the opportunity and thank you for it.

All Americans can be proud of our farmers and their awesome ability to overcome drought, hail, flood, wind, and other vagaries of nature and to produce the most abundant and nutritious supply of food in history.

Those in other countries—friend and foe alike—stand in awe, envy, and thankfulness too that our farmers are able to feed this Nation superbly and yet to produce enough in addition for hungry mouths all over the globe.

The American farmer, working with this administration and a majority of the Congress, has acted these past 5 years to develop farm programs that have brought about amazing results.

It is dramatic and exciting, when you look back at the dismal state of agriculture at the end of the 1950's, to compare today—1966—with 1960.

Gross farm income is up nearly $10 billion.

Net farm income is up nearly $3.5 billion.

Net income per farm is up more than 50 percent.

Per capita farm income is up 50 percent.

Major farm prices are up: Beef steers and heifers up $2.10 per hundredweight since 1960. Hogs up $9 since 1960. Corn up 12 cents a bushel since 1960. Soybeans up 72 cents a bushel since 1960. Manufacturing milk up 52 cents per hundredweight since 1960. Eggs up 9 cents a dozen since 1960.

Acreages of rice, soybeans, barley, and wheat are up. A 15 percent wheat acreage increase has been announced for 1967.

Loans to rural electric and telephone systems are up 26 percent.

Exports are up to the highest point in history.

Loans to rural families and rural communities to improve their way of life are up from $300 million to $1 billion.

A few things are down. They are:

Surpluses.

Taxpayer costs for storage and handling of surpluses.

The percentage of take-home pay needed to buy food.

And, the public standing of those who opposed the farmer, the Congress, and the administration in building this record of farming success.

This administration's unexampled record of success in agriculture is essentially the result of five major legislative acts since 1960. The 40 Members of Congress who signed the wire to the President had an opportunity to cast nearly 200 votes, in total, in support of these important bills for the farmer. However, with 200 chances to help the farmer, you voted "Yes" only 27 times in all. A mere 13 percent of your votes for the farmer—87 percent against him.

That is not a record to write home about. Not if you have farmers in your home district.

Yet you said, in your message to the President, that the administration "acts to undermine the very thing we seek."

Obviously you don't seek the positive gains accomplished by the legislation you rejected—the higher farm income and higher farm prices, greater farm acreage, increased agricultural exports, and all the other benefits for the farmer.

What do you seek?

You complained about dumping stocks of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum. Certainly you know that we sold these grains to meet domestic and world needs. Storage costs were lessened, and farmers' prices remained well above support levels. This was not true before 1960.

You charged erroneously that we raised the support price for soybeans "in order to create a surplus and force down market prices. Certainly you know that our soybean stocks are down to a 3-week supply, and the

price of soybeans has gone up 10 to 20 cents a bushel since the announcement.

What is it you seek? To build new surpluses of wheat, corn, and grain sorghum, and create artificial shortages of food for our people, and hold down exports?

Should incentives be denied for soybean production, thus creating a shortage and causing wild fluctuations in price—and profits for speculators? Is that what you seek?

American agriculture has experienced an unprecedented period of progress in the period 1961–66. The income gap between farmers and nonfarmers has narrowed by nearly 20 percent since 1960. Even so, farmers have a long way to go before achieving income parity.

And it is the continuing objective of this administration to keep agriculture on the rise.

Let me tell you what we seek.

We seek your support in this effort.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN THE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 848, Rept. No. 1498), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 848

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, all points of order against the provisions contained under the heading "National Aeronautics and Space Administration" beginning on page 29, line 18, through page 32, line 2, are hereby waived.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 848, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 848?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 848.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, this rule would make in order consideration of certain phases of the independent offices appropriation bill which was filed on May 5. H.R. 14921, which was filed on May 5, passed the House of Representatives but has not yet passed the Senate. Therefore, the Appropriations Committee has requested that a rule be granted making in order consideration of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration appropriations for this fiscal year.

I have no further requests for time. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG]. This is a necessary procedure in order that the bill can be considered this afternoon, the appropriation bill, because the authorization bill has not as yet been finally acted upon. So we will have to waive points of order so far as they might apply to the language commencing on line 18, page 29, through to the end of that particular section on line 2, page 32.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I hope that it will not become a precedent that the Appropriations Committee asks for rules on bills. I hope the legislative committees will get these bills in their proper sequence.

But in this particular instance it would be futile, it seems to me, to wait for the Senate to act, since the House has acted on its authorization bill.

So I support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we shall not request rules on appropriation bills in the future.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H.R. 14012, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 5, 1966.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Abbitt	Fraser	Morgan
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Morse
Adair	Fulton, Pa.	Moss
Baring	Grabowski	Murray
Brademas	Griffin	O'Hara, Mich.
Burleson	Hanna	Pickle
Callaway	Helstoski	Powell
Carter	Henderson	Rodino
Chelf	Holifield	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Hull	Rosenthal
Colmer	Hutchinson	Rumsfeld
Corman	Kee	Saylor
Diggs	Kelly	Sullivan
Dorn	Keogh	Toll
Dowdy	King, Utah	Tunney
Duncan, Oreg.	Macdonald	Tupper
Edmondson	Mailliard	Utt
Fascell	Mathias	Vivian
Feighan	Michel	Watson
Findley	Moeller	Williams
Fogarty	Monagan	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 357 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on March 29 the House passed the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1966, providing something in excess of $2.5 billion for various agencies of the Government. The bill, as it passed the House, was below the budget requests by nearly $249 million and the final version before us today is more than $232 million below the total budget estimates considered by both the House and Senate.

When the bill went to the other body, additional estimates of $207 million were submitted directly to the Senate. The major items which were added in the other body were based on the additional estimates and I do not think they will be controversial in the House.

First, $30 million was added for the Farmers Home Administration to meet emergency credit needs resulting from Hurricane Betsy, floods in the north-central area, and similar disasters in other regions. This was agreed to unanimously in conference.

The other body added $30 million for the disaster relief fund due to storms, floods, and other natural disasters. The conference agreement adds $20 million to the House amount, for a total of $65 million. The other body added $140 million for the Asian Development Bank, which was authorized by Congress in March of this year. It was too late for that estimate to be considered by the House.

For the Alaska Centennial, in which there has been considerable interest in the Northwest, the other body added $4.6 million; and this was agreed to in conference.

The Post Office Department, finding itself unable to cope with the unanticipated increase in the volume of mail, made a request through the Bureau of the Budget for an additional $25 million; this was, likewise, approved.

Of course, the largest category of money in this bill is in title II—more than

$900 million to finance the civilian and military pay increases voted by the Congress after the submission of the budget last year. It was mandatory that these additional funds be provided.

The total amount required to take care of the additional pay costs was much in excess of this, but by transfers and economies and adjustments otherwise, the total amount of new appropriations needed was reduced to a little over $950 million.

With respect to the items which were considered by both bodies, the conference amount is only $1.2 million above the House bill, and is $13 million less than the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, we trust that this will be the last supplemental or deficiency bill presented to the House for fiscal year 1966. A fiscal year 1967 supplemental bill will probably be considered much later in the session.

I will place a comparative statement with respect to the conference report in the RECORD at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Comparative statement of conference action compared with budget estimates, House bill and Senate bill, the 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966

Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I							
Ch. I. Agriculture	$30,000,000		$30,000,000	$30,000,000		+$30,000,000	
Ch. II. District of Columbia	2,300,000	$1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	−$1,050,000		
Ch. III. Foreign operations	140,000,000		140,000,000	140,000,000		+140,000,000	
Ch. IV. Independent offices	383,693,000	348,280,000	383,793,000	371,112,000	−12,581,000	+22,832,000	−$12,681,000
Ch. V. Interior	26,421,000	22,495,000	26,255,700	25,821,000	−597,000	+3,329,000	−431,700
Ch. VI. Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	1,106,442,000	902,528,000	902,028,000	902,028,000	−204,414,000	−500,000	
Ch. VII. Legislative	17,000	107,000	307,000	337,000	+320,000	+230,000	+30,000
Ch. VIII. Public works	16,024,000	15,570,000	15,920,000	15,920,000	−104,000	+350,000	
Ch. IX. State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	12,682,000	7,260,000	12,020,000	12,020,000	−662,000	+4,760,000	
Ch. X. Post Office	321,010,000	294,010,000	391,010,000	319,010,000	−2,000,000	+25,000,000	
Ch. XI. Claims and judgements	10,828,683	10,251,798	10,828,683	10,828,683		+576,885	
Total, title I	2,049,417,683	1,601,751,798	1,841,412,383	1,828,329,683	−221,088,000	+226,577,885	−13,082,700
TITLE II							
Increased pay costs	971,393,220	963,120,770	959,813,620	959,814,620	−11,579,600	−3,307,150	
Grand total	3,020,810,903	2,564,872,568	2,801,226,003	2,788,143,303	−232,667,600	+223,270,735	−13,082,700

Mr. BOW. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with this conference report. There are items, of course, that I think are much too high, but I think the conferees did the best they could.

There is one particular item I do not agree with, and that is an investigation to be made by some professors into the building and loan institutions of the country. I think there should be an investigation, but I do not agree with the idea of turning the investigation over to three professors. I think it should be done by a different group of people. That is something we can take up later.

Generally, Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the conference report.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the conference report, and I signed the conference report, but since the signing of the conference report there have been several questions asked about the language on page 12 of the bill, because of the discussion that took place in the other body.

This has to do with the National Teacher Corps. This language was inserted in the bill by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare. The first proviso states:

Provided, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 percentum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps.

I believe this language is very clear. It indicates beyond any question of doubt that a 10-percent local contribution will be necessary before a teacher is placed in any local school district.

But concerning the next proviso there seems to be some misunderstanding. Just so there can be no misunderstanding, this was also a proviso offered by me in the committee:

Provided further, That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

This language is very clear. It provides for the approval of each program, on an individual basis, by the State educational agency prior to the time any teacher is assigned by the Office of Education. This does not mean the State must approve an overall State program or State plan.

So that there can be no confusion about this, I thought it was necessary for us to have this colloquy on the floor of the House today.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LAIRD. Does the gentleman from Texas agree that this is very clear?

Mr. MAHON. This is my understanding of the 90-percent proviso.

Mr. LAIRD. And of the approval by the State superintendents or State educational agencies?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. This is my understanding of the intent.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Farmers Home Administration

For an additional amount for the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund," $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses

Included in the expenses of any functions of supervision which shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses, as stated in the third proviso under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, are expenses necessary for special studies of the savings and loan industry to be completed by December 31, 1968, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), which may be of any duration not beyond such completion date.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses

Included in the expenses of any functions of supervision which shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses, as stated in the third proviso under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, are

cxpenses (not to exceed $500,000) necessary for special studies of the savings and loan industry to be completed by December 31, 1968, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), which may be of any duration not beyond such completion date.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permisssion to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. BOW addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Administration of territories

For an additional amount for "Administration of Territories", $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

SENATE

Contingent expenses of the Senate

Inquiries and Investigations

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and investigations", $200,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following:

SENATE

For payment to Mary L. McNamara, widow of Patrick V. McNamara, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $30,000.

Contingent expenses of the Senate

Inquiries and Investigations

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and investigations", $200,000.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

(28) BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Upper Colorado River storage project

For an additional amount for "Upper Colorado River Basin fund", $1,400,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Loan program", Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speakcr, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 17, line 20, strike out the following:

"In addition to the amount heretofore made available in the appropriation under this head for the current fiscal year for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), not to exceed $25,000 shall be available in such appropriation for such compensation and expenses."

And insert in lieu thereof:

"For an additional amount for 'Fees and expenses', including not to exceed $25,000 for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses, general legal activities', fiscal year 1966."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 18, line 17:

"1967 ALASKA CENTENNIAL

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Alaska Centennial Act of 1966, including administrative expenses, to remain available until June 30, 1968, $4,600,000, of which not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for grants to the State of Alaska, and not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the Centennial celebration."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc the amendments numbered 40 through 51.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 30, line 24: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 31, line 4: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 31, line 8: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 31, line 12: ", to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 31, line 16: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics,' Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 31, line 20: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966,".

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 32, line 1: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966, of which $33,400 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs;".

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 32, line 7: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 32, line 13: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 32, line 17: "of which $754,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 33, line 2: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966, of which $200,000 is for administrative".

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 33, line 7: "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Registration and voting statistics', Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 34, line 18:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

"The limitation contained in section 606 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1966, on the funds available for the operation of overseas dependents schools is hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by Public Law 89-391".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14921) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Public Law 89-426
89th Congress, H. R. 14012
May 13, 1966

An Act

80 STAT. 141

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, namely:

Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Farmers Home Administration

For an additional amount for the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund", $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER II

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Federal Payment to District of Columbia

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" for the general fund, $1,250,000.

Operating Expenses

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including $3,700 for disbursement by the administrative office of the United States courts for expenses of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, $1,249,200, of which $111,600 shall be payable from the highway fund, $200 from the water fund, and $200 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", $210,600.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year involved. 79 Stat. 236.

CHAPTER III

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Asian Development Bank

For subscriptions to the Asian Development Bank, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, to remain available until expended, $140,000,000, of which $20,000,000 shall be available for the first installment on paid-in capital stock, $20,000,000 shall be available for the second installment on such stock, and $100,000,000 shall be available for the entire subscription to callable capital stock.

Ante, p. 71.

CHAPTER IV

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

National Capital Housing Authority

operation and maintenance of properties

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance of properties", $12,000.

Selective Service System

salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $12,000,000.

Veterans Administration

general operating expenses

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", $1,000,000.

compensation and pensions

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", $288,000,000, to remain available until expended.

readjustment benefits

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Relief

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", including not to exceed $75,000 for the purposes of section 5 of the Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–41), $65,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

79 Stat. 132.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Secretary

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

For rent supplements authorized by section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, $100,000: *Provided*, That the maximum payments in any fiscal year for rent supplements required by all contracts which may be entered into under such section shall not exceed $12,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation or contract authority shall be used for incurring any obligation in connection with any dwelling unit or project which is not either part of a workable program for community improvement meeting the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), or which is without local official approval for participation in this program.

79 Stat. 451.
12 USC 1701s and note.
68 Stat. 623.

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Included in the expenses of any functions of supervision which shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses, as stated in the third proviso under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1966, are expenses (not to exceed $500,000) necessary for special studies of the savings and loan industry to be completed by December 31, 1968, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), which may be of any duration not beyond such completion date.

79 Stat. 540.
60 Stat. 810.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $1,495,000.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", $755,000.

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", $1,028,000.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", $827,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $1,711,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For an additional amount for "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)", $5,500,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Administration of Territories", $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $148,000.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", $658,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For additional amounts for "Forest protection and utilization", as follows:

"Forest land management", $9,635,000;
"Forest research", $610,000; and
"State and private forestry cooperation", $45,000.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $18,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $18,000.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For an additional amount for "Transitional grants to Alaska", $876,000.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses of worker adjustment assistance allowances and for administration of adjustment assistance services to workers as provided in Title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794), and Title III of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–283), $1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen". 76 Stat. 895. 19 USC 1901. 79 Stat. 1018. 19 USC 2021.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses," $1,028,000, of which $821,900 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" and $206,100 may be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

Wage and Labor Standards

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For and additional amount for "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", $614,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Expansion and improvement of vocational education", for advances for reserve funds and interest payments on insured loans under the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, $950,000, of which $100,000 for interest payments shall remain available until expended and $850,000 for advances shall remain available until June 30, 1968. 79 Stat. 1037. 20 USC 981 note.

VOCATIONAL STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

For the vocational student loan insurance fund created by section 13 of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (70 Stat. 1046), $50,000, to remain available until expended. 79 Stat. 1046. 20 USC 992.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Elementary and secondary educational activities", for meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children under title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, $184,000,000. 79 Stat. 27. 20 USC 241a-241l.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher Educational Activities", $11,300,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for basic grants authorized in section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $1,000,000 shall be for training grants under section 223 of that Act, and $300,000 shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials under part C of title II of that Act.

79 Stat. 1224.
20 USC 1022.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

For the National Teacher Corps authorized in part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $9,500,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used to pay in excess of 90 per centum of the salary of any teacher in the National Teacher Corps: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be spent on behalf of any National Teacher Corps program in any local school system prior to approval of such program by the State educational agency of the State in which the school system is located.

20 USC 1091-1118.

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts", $41,000,000.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

GRANTS TO STATES

For an additional amount for "Grants to States", for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, $39,000,000.

79 Stat. 1282.
29 USC 32.

Public Health Service

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For an additional amount for "National Library of Medicine", including carrying out the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1059), $4,175,000, of which $4,000,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1967.

42 USC 280b note.

Social Security Administration

PAYMENT TO TRUST FUNDS FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance trust funds, as authorized by sections 103 and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, and section 1844 of the Social Security Act, $125,800,000, of which $100,000,000 shall remain available through December 31, 1967, as authorized by section 1844.

79 Stat. 333, 343.
42 USC 426 note, 1395i-1.
42 USC 1395w.

PAYMENT FOR MILITARY SERVICE CREDITS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, the Federal Disability Insurance, and the Federal Hospital Insurance trust funds, for benefit payments and other costs resulting from non-

contributory coverage extended certain veterans as provided under section 217(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, $105,000,000. 79 Stat. 396. 42 USC 417.

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance", $381,000,000.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

GALLAUDET COLLEGE, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", $24,000.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Howard University, salaries and expenses", $216,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration", $13,000, together with not to exceed $53,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", $1,075,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

CHAPTER VII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

For payment to Mary L. McNamara, widow of Patrick V. McNamara, late a Senator from the State of Michigan, $30,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and investigations", $200,000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Eva Hassell Bonner, widow of Herbert C. Bonner, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina, $30,000.

For payment to Lera Millard Thomas, widow of Albert Thomas, late a Representative from the State of Texas, $30,000.

For payment to Mary I. Baldwin, widow of John F. Baldwin, late a Representative from the State of California, $30,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For an additional amount for "Capitol grounds", $17,000.

CHAPTER VIII

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL DEPARTMENT

OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, general", $7,350,000, to remain available until expended.

FLOOD CONTROL, HURRICANE AND SHORE PROTECTION EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control, hurricane and shore protection emergencies", $7,750,000, to remain available until expended.

THE PANAMA CANAL

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", $300,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $520,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For an additional amount for "Upper Colorado River Basin fund", $1,400,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Loan program", Bureau of Reclamation.

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service", $450,000.

PAYMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund, $45,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal Activities and General Administration

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses", including not to exceed $25,000 for compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses), $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", fiscal year 1966.

Federal Prison System

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", $475,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent Office

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $1,000,000.

1967 Alaska Centennial

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Alaska Centennial Act of 1966, including administrative expenses, to remain available until June 30, 1968, $4,600,000, of which not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for grants to the State of Alaska, and not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the Centennial celebration. Ante, p. 82.

International Activities

INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

For expenses necessary to conduct the studies and submit the reports, and for related expenses, required by section 2(b) of the Act of February 19, 1966 (Public Law 89–355), as to the proposed participation by the United States, by foreign countries, and industry in Interama, $160,000, to remain available until expended. Ante, p. 6.

THE JUDICIARY

Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", $200,000.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and commissioners", $1,165,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

Commission on Civil Rights

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $425,000.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Civil rights educational activities," including not to exceed $225,000 for salaries and expenses, $3,000,000.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $500,000.

CHAPTER X

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Operations", $294,904,000.

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for "Transportation", $21,000,000.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", $3,106,000.

CHAPTER XI

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 87 and House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,828,683, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in said judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

Legislative Branch

Senate:

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators", $8,065;
"Salaries, officers and employees", $543,105;
"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", $7,425;
Contingent expenses of the Senate:
"Senate policy committees", $9,940;
"Automobiles and maintenance", $840;
"Inquiries and investigations", $116,865, including $3,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;
"Folding documents", $945;
"Miscellaneous items", $32,065, including $16,200 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961; 75 Stat. 199. 40 USC 174j-4.

Joint Items:

"Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal expenditures", $945, to remain available until expended;
Contingent expenses of the Senate:
"Joint Economic Committee", $9,000;
"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", $8,250;
"Joint Committee on Printing", $3,750;
Contingent expenses of the House:
"Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation", $10,530;
"Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy", $655;
"Joint Committee on Defense Production", $2,160;

House:

"Compensation of Members", $7,500;
"Office of the Speaker", $3,155;
"Office of the Parliamentarian", $2,755;
"Compilation of Precedents", $270;
"Office of the Chaplain", $410;
"Office of the Clerk", $41,230;
"Office of the Sergeant at Arms", $28,205;
"Office of the Doorkeeper", $43,745;
"Office of the Postmaster", $13,825;
"Committee employees", $103,000;
"Six minority employees", $3,175;
"Majority floor leader", $2,340;
"Minority floor leader", $1,940;
"Majority whip", $1,565;
"Minority whip", $1,565;
"Printing clerks", $430;
"Technical assistant to attending physician", $385;
"Official reporters of debates", $6,880;
"Official reporters to committees", $6,940;
"Legislative counsel", $7,970;
"Members' clerk hire", $770,000;
"Special and select committees", $100,000;
"Coordinator of information", $3,675;
"Revision of the laws", $730;

"Speaker's auto", $330;
"Majority leader's auto", $330;
"Minority leader's auto", $330;
"Miscellaneous items", $19,000, for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812);

54 Stat. 1056.
40 USC 174k.

Architect of the Capitol:
Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", $13,900;
Capitol buildings and grounds:
"Capitol buildings", $40,000;
"Capitol grounds", $10,000;
"Senate office buildings", $31,000;
"Senate garage", $600;
"Capitol power plant", $10,000;
"Library buildings and grounds, structural and mechanical care", $13,000;
Botanic Garden: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000;
Library of Congress:
"Salaries and expenses", $256,700;
Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", $51,500;
Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", $62,200;
Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses", $65,300;
Books for the Blind: "Salaries and expenses", $6,600;
"Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)", $3,600;
Government Printing Office:
Office of Superintendent of Documents:
"Salaries and expenses": Not to exceed $65,000 of the reserve fund under this head for the current fiscal year may be used for increased pay costs authorized by law.

The Judiciary

Supreme Court of the United States:
"Salaries", $41,000;
"Care of Buildings and Grounds", $5,000;
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;
Customs Court: "Salaries and expenses", $19,000;
Court of Claims: "Salaries and expenses", $13,300;
Court of appeals; district courts, and other judicial services:
"Salaries of supporting personnel", $818,000;
"Administrative Office of the United States Courts", $31,000;
"Expenses of referees", $125,000, to be derived from the "Referees' salary and expense fund".

Executive Office of the President

The White House Office:
"Salaries and expenses", $85,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Special projects", fiscal year 1966;
Bureau of the Budget: "Salaries and expenses", $131,000;
Council of Economic Advisers: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000;
National Security Council: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000;
Office of Emergency Planning: "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies", $86,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", fiscal year 1966;

Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: "Salaries and expenses", $8,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic assistance:

"Administrative expenses", Agency for International Development, $980,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966;

"Administrative and other expenses", Department of State, $42,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service:

"Salaries and expenses", as follows:

"Research", $2,402,500; and

"Plant and animal disease and pest control", $1,268,500;

Cooperative State Research Service: "Payments and expenses", $32,000;

Extension Service: "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses": Of the amount made available under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, for "Payment to States and Puerto Rico", $64,000 shall be transferred to the subappropriation for "Federal Extension Service"; 79 Stat. 1167.

Farmer Cooperative Service: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

Soil Conservation Service:

"Conservation operations", $2,608,000;

"Watershed planning", $140,000, to remain available until expended;

"Watershed protection", $585,000, to remain available until expended;

"Flood prevention", $160,000, to remain available until expended;

"Great Plains conservation program", $82,000, to remain available until expended;

"Resource conservation and development", $46,000, to remain available until expended;

Economic Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", $246,000;

Statistical Reporting Service: "Salaries and expenses", $250,000;

Consumer and Marketing Service: "Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", $1,905,000;

Foreign Agricultural Service: "Salaries and expenses", $178,000;

Commodity Exchange Authority: "Salaries and expenses", $28,000;

Rural Electrification Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $268,000;

Farmers Home Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000;

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: "Administrative and operating expenses", $202,000;

Rural Community Development Service: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

Office of the Inspector General: "Salaries and expenses", $145,000;

Office of the General Counsel: "Salaries and expenses", $102,000;

Office of Information: "Salaries and expenses", $26,000;

National Agricultural Library: "Salaries and expenses", $36,000;

Office of Management Services: "Salaries and expenses", $59,000;

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000;

Forest Service: "Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)", $964,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $89,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

Office of Business Economics: "Salaries and expenses", $50,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of the Census:

"Salaries and expenses", $320,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", fiscal year 1966;

"1964 Census of Agriculture", $110,000, to remain available until December 31, 1967, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", fiscal year 1966;

Business and Defense Services Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $125,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

International Activities:

"Salaries and expenses", $160,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966, of which $23,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1967;

"Export control", $100,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966, of which $33,400 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs;

Office of Field Services: "Salaries and expenses", $90,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

Coast and Geodetic Survey: "Salaries and expenses", $510,000;

National Bureau of Standards: "Research and technical services", $500,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

Weather Bureau:

"Salaries and expenses", $1,200,000 of which $754,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

"Research and development", $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1968;

"Meteorological satellite operations", $48,000, to remain available until expended;

Maritime Administration:

"Salaries and expenses", $222,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966, of which $200,000 is for administrative expenses and $22,000 is for reserve fleet expenses;

"Maritime training", $38,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Registration and voting statistics", Bureau of the Census, fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Public Roads: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $950,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administration and research).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Military personnel:
"Military personnel, Army", $222,100,000;
"Military personnel, Navy", $182,600,000;
"Military personnel, Marine Corps", $42,400,000;
"Military personnel, Air Force", $227,600,000;
"Reserve personnel, Navy", $4,600,000;
"Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", $1,600,000;
"Reserve personnel, Air Force", $1,200,000;
"National Guard personnel, Army", $4,500,000;
"National Guard personnel, Air Force", $3,500,000;
"Retired pay, Defense", $71,000,000;
Operation and maintenance:
"Operation and maintenance, Army", $33,400,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Navy", $23,000,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", $1,054,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Air Force", $27,600,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", $14,356,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", $2,000,000;
"Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard", $1,000,000;
"Court of Military Appeals, Defense", $11,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The limitation contained in section 606 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1966, on the funds available for the operation of overseas dependents schools is hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by Public Law 89-391. 79 Stat. 873. Ante, p. 117.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army:
Cemeterial expenses: "Salaries and expenses", $67,000;
Corps of Engineers—Civil: "General expenses", $385,000;
Ryukyu Islands, Army: "Administration", $40,000;
The Panama Canal:
Panama Canal Company: "Limitation on general and administrative expenses" (increase of $137,000 in the limitation on the amount available for general and administrative expenses);
United States Soldiers' Home: "Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay" (increase of $146,000 in the amount available for maintenance and operation to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service:
"Hospitals and medical care", $770,000;
"Foreign quarantine activities", $212,000;
"Indian health activities", $1,355,000;
Saint Elizabeths Hospital: "Salaries and expenses", the total amount available for "Salaries and expenses" in the "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966", is hereby increased from $29,886,000 to $30,613,000; 79 Stat. 603.

Social Security Administration: "Limitation on salaries and expenses, Social Security Administration" (increase of $8,037,000 in the amount to be expended, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein);

79 Stat. 338.
42 USC 401.

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $18,000, to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund;

"Surplus property utilization", $20,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Federal Housing Administration: "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration" (increase of $575,000 in the limitation for nonadministrative expenses);

Public Housing Administration:

"Administrative expenses", $405,000;

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Public Housing Administration" (increase of $405,000 in the limitation for administrative expenses).

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs:

"Education and welfare services", $1,202,400;

"General administrative expenses", $103,000;

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Office of Territories: "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands", $102,600;

Mineral Resources:

Geological Survey: "Surveys, investigations, and research", $1,510,000;

Bureau of Mines:

"Conservation and development of mineral resources", $500,000;

"Health and safety", $92,000;

"General administrative expenses", $22,000;

Office of Oil and Gas: "Salaries and expenses", $16,300;

Fish and Wildlife Service:

Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife: "Salaries and expenses", $8,500;

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

"Management and investigation of resources", $86,800, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Federal aid for commercial fisheries, research and development", fiscal year 1966;

"General administrative expenses", $15,000;

"Administration of Pribilof Islands", $10,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: "General administrative expenses", $34,300;

National Park Service: "General administrative expenses", $57,000;

Bureau of Reclamation: "General administrative expenses", $241,200, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operation and maintenance", fiscal year 1966;

Bonneville Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $173,000;

Southwestern Power Administration: "Operation and maintenance", $25,300;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $109,800;

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $105,000;

Office of Water Resources Research: "Salaries and expenses", $6,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration:

Alien property activities: "Limitation on general administrative expenses" (increase of $7,000 in the amount for general administrative expenses);

"Salaries and expenses, antitrust division", $45,000;

"Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", $647,000;

Federal Bureau of Investigation: "Salaries and expenses", $3,735,000;

Immigration and Naturalization Service: "Salaries and expenses", $1,782,000;

Federal Prison System: "Salaries and expenses", $1,035,000.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration:

Office of Manpower Administrator: "Salaries and expenses", $66,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Manpower development and training activities", $25,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training: "Salaries and expenses", $87,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Wage and Labor Standards:

Bureau of Labor Standards: "Salaries and expenses", $39,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Women's Bureau: "Salaries and expenses", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of Employees' Compensation: "Salaries and expenses", $58,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $1,550 to be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 944); 44 Stat. 1444.

Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Salaries and expenses", $242,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

Bureau of International Labor Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $15,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," fiscal year 1966;

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966, together with not to exceed $3,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, unemployment trust fund;

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", $35,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966;

"Federal contract compliance program", $7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", fiscal year 1966.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

"Administration and regional operation", $1,500,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,760,000, of which $1,299,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966, and $123,600 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "extension and remodeling, State Department Building";

International organizations and conferences: "Missions to international organizations", $59,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966;

International commissions:

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: "Salaries and expenses", $17,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Contributions to international organizations", fiscal year 1966.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", $138,000;

Bureau of Customs: "Salaries and expenses", $2,043,000;

Bureau of Narcotics: "Salaries and expenses", $80,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

Bureau of the Public Debt: "Administering the public debt", $360,000;

Coast Guard:

"Operating expenses", $9,400,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966;

"Retired pay", $1,000,000;

"Reserve training", $1,050,000;

Internal Revenue Service:

"Salaries and expenses", $381,000;

"Revenue accounting and processing", $3,472,000;

"Compliance", $9,305,000;

Office of the Treasurer: "Salaries and expenses", $60,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Mint", fiscal year 1966.

United States Secret Service: "Salaries and expenses, guard force", $11,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, United States Secret Service", fiscal year 1966.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

"Operations", $8,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport", $54,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport", $62,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", $4,600,000;

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service", $861,000, of which $55,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966;

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", $336,000;

"Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service", $135,000, of which $45,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expenses, United States court facilities", fiscal year 1966, and $90,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966;

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", $33,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Operating expenses, Utilization and Disposal Service", fiscal year 1966.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"General operating expenses", $1,000,000;

"Medical and prosthetic research", $365,000;

"Medical care", $17,456,000.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Civil Aeronautics Board: "Salaries and expenses", $240,000;

Civil Service Commission:

"Salaries and expenses", $528,000, and in addition $15,000 may be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations";

"Limitation on administrative expenses, employees life insurance fund" (increase of $6,200 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Farm Credit Administration: "Limitation on administrative expenses" (increase of $28,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review: "Salaries and expenses", $1,500;

Federal Communications Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $346,000;

80 STAT. 160

Federal Home Loan Bank Board:

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (increase of $75,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation" (increase of $6,000 in the limitation on the amount available for administrative expenses);

Federal Maritime Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $68,000;

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: "Salaries and expenses", $115,000;

Federal Power Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $300,000;

Federal Trade Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $312,500;

General Accounting Office: "Salaries and expenses", $535,000;

Intergovernmental commissions:

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: "Salaries and expenses", $5,000;

Interstate Commerce Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $625,000;

National Labor Relations Board: "Salaries and expenses", $548,100;

National Mediation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $27,000;

Renegotiation Board: "Salaries and expenses", $30,000;

Small Business Administration: "Salaries and expenses", $150,000;

Smithsonian Institution:

"Salaries and expenses", $453,000;

"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", $66,000;

Tariff Commission: "Salaries and expenses", $46,000;

Tax Court of the United States: "Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

United States Information Agency: "Salaries and expenses", $1,005,000.

District of Columbia

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

Operating expenses:

"General operating expenses", $325,800, of which $4,000 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $1,400 from the motor vehicle parking account), $800 from the water fund, and $100 from the sanitary sewage works fund;

"Health and welfare", $920,500;

"Highways and traffic", $95,900, of which $78,000 shall be payable from the highway fund;

"Sanitary engineering", $253,000, of which $59,300 shall be payable from the water fund and $20,700 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

division of expenses

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1966.

79 Stat. 236.

General Provision

Sec. 202. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the

fiscal year 1966, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Approved May 13, 1966.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 1349 (Comm. on Appropriations), and No. 1476 (Comm. of Conference).
SENATE REPORT No. 1137 (Comm. on Appropriations).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 112 (1966):
Mar. 29: Considered and passed House.
Apr. 27: Considered and passed Senate, amended.
May 10: House and Senate agreed to conference report.